

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 15, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

WITH REFERENCE to the intimation made by the Lord Chief Justice that the common law judges will decline to try jury cases sent for trial from the Chancery Division, we may state that the judges of that division some time ago, upon full consideration of the provisions of the Judicature Acts and rules, came to the conclusion that it was not the intention of the Legislature that jury cases should be tried in their courts.

WE HOPE A TIME WILL ARRIVE when learned judges will deal with the rules enacted by the Legislature in the schedule to the Judicature Act of last year somewhat less in the spirit in which irascible people deal with intrusive blue-bottle flies. On the first two days of this week the Queen's Bench Divisional Court devoted itself to a somewhat excited chase after defects in the new system. In *Northampton Water-Works Company v. Euston*, on Monday, the subject of attack was the order relating to third-party notices (ord. 16, rr. 17—20), and the Lord Chief Justice is reported, first of all, to have fallen upon the Court of Appeal, apparently on account of the dictum of Mellish, L.J., in *Trelaven v. Bray* (fully reported *ante*, p. 112; see also 24 W. R. 198), that the intention of the rules was not to enable a defendant to obtain relief against a third person, but only to bind the third person by the result of the action; and subsequently to have expressed an opinion that it would be unjust to make third persons parties to the action without hearing them, and the court granted a rule nisi, being apparently forgetful of the circumstance that, under ord. 53, no rule or order to show cause is to be granted except in the cases in which an application for such rule or order is expressly authorized by the rules, and that an order under ord. 16 is not one of the cases specified. In a subsequent case of *Coodo v. Harrison* the Lord Chief Justice is reported to have intimated that the judges of the common law divisions will refuse to try actions which are sent from the Chancery Division to be tried by judge and jury in London or Middlesex. Since, by ord. 36, r. 16, the list of actions for trial at the sittings in London and Middlesex is to be prepared, and the actions allotted for trial, without reference to the division of the High Court to which such actions may be attached, we fail to see that the learned judges will succeed in carrying out their threat. The observation was probably aimed at the course taken by Hall, V.C., in *Clarke v. Cookson* (see *ante*, p. 431, reported in this week's WEEKLY REPORTER), but it strikes us as somewhat unworthy of the bench. The court again appears to have been greatly exercised on Tuesday last, in a case of *Sugg v. Silver*, by finding that under the Judicature Acts and rules there is no power to compel a party who desires to have his case tried by a judge and jury to have it tried before a judge and assessors, and on the strength of this discovery the Lord Chief Justice is reported to have condemned the

rules as "hastily drawn." A little consideration might have suggested to the learned judge that it may have been the deliberate intention of the framers of the rules, and of Parliament, that parties who chose to have their actions tried by a judge and jury should not be ousted of that right at the will of the bench.

IT IS OUR PAINFUL duty to caution the public and the Legislature against an insidious attempt to push the interests of Home Rule by means of a scheme for the exclusion from relief in the civil courts of all persons unfortunate enough to live in that obscure portion of the United Kingdom called England. The boldness of the projectors may be gathered from the fact that they actually seek to carry out their objects by obtaining an Act of Parliament for that purpose; and their ingenuity may be gathered from the fact that the proposed statute makes its appearance in the harmless guise of "An Act to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875." The Bill now before Parliament, on the back of which appear the names of Mr. Butt, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, and another, is very short, and we give its exact words:—"Notwithstanding anything in the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, contained, no service of any writ of summons, or notice of any writ of summons, in any action in the High Court of Justice shall be allowed in case any defendant in such action, being a British subject, shall be resident in Scotland or in Ireland." The reader will see at once that, provided a single defendant is resident in Ireland, the High Court is to be paralyzed, not only as against him, but as against all the other defendants. If a corresponding provision with respect to "British subjects" resident in England, can be introduced into the Irish Judicature Bill, the effect of the two measures may be to enable any pair of Milesian gentlemen, residing one in Ireland and one in England, by careful joint action, to do what they like with the unhappy English, and to snap their fingers at the High Courts. We may add that the ingenuity of the project cannot be wholly appreciated until it is observed that room is left for the projectors to say that the whole thing is a kind of blunder or bull, and that their real meaning is only to provide that defendants in Ireland or Scotland shall not be served, leaving defendants in England as they were before the "amending" Act. But can anyone believe that Mr. Butt is unable, with the aid of two other honourable members, to express a very simple idea in an intelligible manner?

WE VENTURED some weeks ago (*ante*, p. 155) to point out that the Master of the Rolls in *In re Dagleish's Settlement* (24 W. R. 53) had gone out of his way to restrict the application of a very useful section of the Trustee Act, 1850. He held that the power given by section 34 of vesting the lands subject to the trust upon making any order appointing new trustees, could only be exercised where there existed some person in whom the property was vested who was capable of making an effectual assignment. This view he founded on the words in section 34 providing that the effect of the vesting order shall be the same "as if the person or persons who, before such order, were the trustee or trustees (if any) had duly executed all proper conveyances and assignments of such lands for such estate." It appeared to us that there was nothing in the section to support this view, and that the words above quoted were intended to define the operation of the vesting order, and not to restrict the power of making it. In the case of *In re Rathbone*, Vice-Chancellor Hall followed *In re Dagleish's Settlement*, and refused to make an order vesting the trust property in the new trustees. But upon appeal this decision was, on the 5th inst., reversed by the Court of Appeal, and their lordships made the vesting order notwithstanding there was no one capable of making an effectual assignment. In *In re Rathbone*, there were no

surviving trustees, and Vice-Chancellor Hall had appointed new trustees of the will; hence, the other question did not arise which came before the court in *In re Dugleish's Trusts*, viz., whether, after trustees had been duly appointed under a power, and difficulty was found in conveying the trust estate to them, the court would, under section 32, either re-appoint them or appoint a new trustee, for the mere purpose of affording a ground for the exercise of the power of vesting the property under section 34. It may be hoped that this convenient, if somewhat unwarranted, practice will be maintained.

THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL has passed through the House of Lords without any substantial change. A few words have been added to clause 6, indicating that peers may be appointed Lords of Appeal in Ordinary; a slight alteration has been made in the position and wording of the provision as to the power of the House to make orders imposing conditions as to the value of the subject-matter in dispute and as to security for costs; and an addition has been made to clause 14, providing that the rules to be made for the attendance of the archbishops and bishops at the hearing of ecclesiastical cases shall be laid before Parliament. It remains to be seen whether the course of the Bill through the Commons will be equally smooth.

OUR READERS will remember that, on the last day of the Michaelmas Sittings, Cockburn, C.J., sitting in the Queen's Bench Division, declined to give priority to a motion behind the bar, on the ground that the privilege formerly enjoyed by junior counsel on the last day of term could not exist after the abolition of terms. On Wednesday last, however, Vice-Chancellor Hall adhered to the old practice of giving priority to motions behind the bar, evidently considering that neither the increased length of the sittings, nor the fact of their being called by a new name, afforded any sufficient reason for depriving members of the junior bar of their ancient privilege.

THE REGISTRAR'S OFFICE will be open to-day (Saturday) for the usual vacation hours—viz., from eleven to one; but will be closed on Monday and Tuesday. The chambers of the Vice-Chancellors and of the Master of the Rolls will be closed until Wednesday next. On and after that day we believe one division in each of the chambers will be open daily until the 25th inst.

THE COURT OF APPEAL has decided the question raised in *Mercier v. Cotton* in accordance with the view we put forward a fortnight ago. The court held that the judge was not entitled to say, as a matter of course, that interrogatories are premature because they are delivered before the statement of defence; but he may strike out the interrogatories unless reasonable cause can be shown for requiring information at that time. The court thought that this course would be justified under the power in Ord. 31, r. 5 to strike out interrogatories not put *bond fide* for the purpose of the action; we ventured to think that an alteration of r. 1 would be necessary; so long, however, as the result is reached, it matters little how it is attained.

Mr. Justice Quain sat in the Queen's Bench Division on Monday for the first time after his recent severe illness.

On Saturday Lord Justice James said it was uncertain how the Court of Appeal would be constituted during the next sittings. In all probability the three Lords Justices would not all be sitting together again until the summer circuits begin.

THE NEW PRACTICE.

PLEADINGS.—In a case which came before the Master of the Rolls on April 12, on a motion under ord. 40, r. 11, his lordship took occasion to make some remarks upon the present form of pleadings, for the guidance of the profession practising in his court. "I intend," he said, "to construe r. 22 of ord. 19 strictly; the meaning of the rules of ord. 19 is to prevent the issue being at large, and to bring the parties to a definite issue. Ord. 40, r. 11, enables the plaintiff or the defendant to get rid of so much of the subject-matter of the action as is not in dispute by taking an order on the admissions of fact upon the pleadings. What admissions are is defined by ord. 19, r. 17, which requires specific denial or refusal to admit; consequently, where there is no specific denial or refusal to admit, there is an admission. Then r. 20 shows what specific denial or specific refusal to admit is, and, that there may be no mistake, r. 22 is added to explain how a denial must not be made." His lordship proceeded to apply his remarks to the pleadings then before him, and to point out that, as the plaintiff had alleged an agreement for a partnership upon certain terms and under certain circumstances, and the defendant had denied the agreement as alleged, it was impossible to discover what part of the statement of claim the defendant intended to dispute. "The defendant," his lordship continued, "is bound, if he intends to deny that any agreement whatever was come to between him and the plaintiff, to do so specifically, or, if he does not mean that, then he must deny that there was any agreement except such as he sets forth. The result of the present rules is similar to the rule existing in chancery before the orders of August, 1841, when the defendant had to answer the substance of the bill, whether specially interrogated thereon or not. It is said that this will be a hardship upon the defendant in obliging him to discover his points of defence; but that is the very object of the rules of pleading. Otherwise there might be an agreement containing fifty stipulations, and if the defendant were allowed to deny the agreement generally, the plaintiff might have to come into court prepared with fifty different witnesses to prove the fifty different stipulations, whilst the defendant was only prepared to dispute one of the fifty stipulations. What would be said of a system of pleading under which such a state of things was possible?"

JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT.—A correspondent asks what is the practice in the London offices as to filing a copy of the writ of summons and indorsement thereon on signing judgment in default of appearance to an eight-day or twelve-day writ. We are able to say that in the London offices it is not considered necessary on signing judgment in default of appearance to leave with the officer a copy of the writ of summons issued on commencing the action, production of the original only, or of a copy of it, being accepted as sufficient. Where, however, the affidavit of service of the writ refers to a copy of it as "hereunto annexed," the copy must be filed with the affidavit. This practice obtains in all the London offices attached to the several divisions of the High Court, and is applied, generally, to eight-day and twelve-day writs, the admitted reason being that, inasmuch as a copy of the writ commencing an action is now, in all cases, retained and filed by the officer charged with the duty of sealing the writ, it becomes quite unnecessary afterwards to file or record a second copy of it. It must be mentioned, however, that, notwithstanding this recognized and applied practice, an opinion is entertained by some favourable to a strict compliance with the express provisions of the Bills of Exchange Act (18 & 19 Vict. c. 67), in cases where the writ is issued pursuant to that Act.

MOTIONS FOR JUDGMENT.—We publish elsewhere a notice which will help to regulate the loose practice which has hitherto prevailed on this subject. On motion days it has been the custom to move for judgment on a two-days' notice, the cause neither being set down nor being in the paper of the day. In the hurry of business the fact that these causes ought previously to be set down has been overlooked. It is now directed that motions for judgment shall be set down in the cause-book, and shall come on for hearing in their regular order, either as short causes or otherwise according to circumstances. An exception to this rule is made in cases where the plaintiff moves for such order as he is entitled to on admissions in the pleadings under ord. 40, z. 11.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

APPEAL FROM INTERIM ORDER—SHORT NOTICE OF MOTION—ORD. 53, r. 4.—On Tuesday, April 11, in a case of *Seale v. Lambe, Caldecott* applied to the Court of Appeal under the following circumstances:—Notice had been given by the plaintiff, by leave of Vice-Chancellor Malins, of motion for an injunction to be heard at the sitting of the court that morning. When the case was opened the Vice-Chancellor declined to hear it, because of the pressure of other business, but said that he would make an *interim* order for an injunction extending over Wednesday, the regular motion day, and he made this order without hearing counsel for the defendant, who declined to give any undertaking. The result of this would be that, owing to the pressure of other motions in that branch of the court, the case would not be heard on Wednesday, the *interim* order would be continued as a matter of course, and thus the defendant would be deprived of his legal rights till after the Easter vacation. The defendant, therefore, asked the Court of Appeal to assist him. The court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) gave the defendant leave to serve short notice of motion by way of appeal from the *interim* order, the motion to be heard on Wednesday morning, observing that if the Court of Appeal should discharge the *interim* order it could not be afterwards continued by the Vice-Chancellor.

STAYING PROCEEDINGS PENDING APPEAL—SHORT NOTICE OF MOTION—ORD. 58, rr. 16, 17; ORD. 53, r. 4.—On the same day a case of *Cooper v. Cooper* was mentioned to the Court of Appeal. A decree had been made by Vice-Chancellor Bacon for the payment of money and costs. The defendant had given notice of appeal, and had applied to the Vice-Chancellor to stay execution pending the appeal, but the Vice-Chancellor had refused this application. *J. Chester* now applied to the Court of Appeal, and said that the defendant apprehended that execution would be issued against him in a few days, and, if he had to give the ordinary two days' notice of appeal from the refusal to stay execution, the appeal could not be heard before the vacation. The court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) said that as the application, by ord. 58, r. 17, could not be made to the Court of Appeal until it had been made to the Vice-Chancellor, a new notice of motion must be given. But under the circumstances the defendant might give short notice of motion for Wednesday. On Wednesday the motion was heard, and an order was made staying execution on the terms of bringing the money and costs into court. And, following *Mary v. Nickolls*, (L. R. 8 Ch. 205), the court held that the applicant must pay the costs of the motion, inasmuch as he was asking for an indulgence.

INTERROGATORIES DELIVERED BEFORE DEFENCE—POWER TO STRIKE OUT—ORD. 31, rr. 1, 5.—The question of the right of a plaintiff to deliver interrogatories to the defendant before the delivery of the statement of defence came before the Court of Appeal on Wednesday, April 12, in a case of *Mercier v. Cotton*, which was an action for damages for an alleged libel. The action was brought in the Queen's Bench Division. The plaintiff, with his statement of claim, delivered to the defendant a series of in-

terrogatories directed to all the allegations of the statement. The defendant applied, by summons in chambers, to have the interrogatories struck out as immaterial at that stage of the action. When the application came on for hearing it was stated, on behalf of the defendant, that he would probably admit the publication of the libel and seek to justify it, and Mr. Baron Pollock, in accordance with the practice which has been adopted in the judge's chambers of the common law divisions, without looking at the interrogatories, ordered them to be struck out as premature, because they had been delivered before the defence. The plaintiff then applied to a divisional court to rescind this order. The judges who heard the application (Cockburn, C.J., and Archibald, J.) differed in opinion. Cockburn, C.J., thought that the plaintiff was, under ord. 31, r. 1, entitled as of right to deliver the interrogatories with his statement of claim, and that they could not be struck out merely on the ground that they were premature because delivered before the defence. The rule had given the plaintiff the right to deliver them when he did, and though, as his lordship agreed, it was very undesirable that this should be done in every action as a matter of course, the judges could not repeal the provisions of the rules which the Legislature had enacted. Archibald, J., thought the practice which had been adopted was right, and the result was that the application was refused. The plaintiff then came to the Court of Appeal, who (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) were unanimously of opinion that Mr. Baron Pollock's order was right. They said that though r. 1 was intended to alter the old practice at common law, and to give the plaintiff a right to administer interrogatories to the defendant without previously obtaining the leave of the court, it was not meant that in every simple common law action interrogatories should be delivered as a matter of course before it was known what the defendant would admit. If this were done in every case it would lead to a great deal of unnecessary expense, and would be an abuse of the practice. In ninety-nine out of a hundred actions in the common law divisions interrogatories would be wholly unnecessary when the defence was put in, and it was in the interest of plaintiffs themselves that the manufacture of useless costs should be discouraged. Of all actions an action for libel was one in which it was peculiarly unnecessary that interrogatories should be administered before it was known whether the defendant admitted the publication, for the plaintiff must, before he started, know his own case, viz., the libel of which he complained. The right to administer interrogatories with the statement of claim was intended to provide for actions of a kind very rare in the common law divisions, but more familiar in courts of equity, where the plaintiff did not know his own case, except in a vague general way, and had to find it out from the answers of the defendant. The rules were in fact, as Lord Justice Mellish said, a compromise between the chancery and common law systems of practice. *Primâ facie* the plaintiff has now a right in every case to deliver interrogatories with his statement of claim. If then an application was made by the defendant to strike them out, the judge was not entitled to say, as a matter of course, that they were premature because delivered before the defence, but he was entitled to call upon the plaintiff to give a good reason for delivering them before that time, to show in fact that discovery was material to him at that stage of the action. If the plaintiff could not do this, the judge was justified in concluding that the interrogatories were not delivered *bonâ fide* for the purpose of discovery, and in striking them out. The exercise of this power would not deprive the plaintiff of his right to discovery, as it would still be open to him to deliver interrogatories at any time before the close of the pleadings.

SERVICE OF WRIT ON FOREIGN CORPORATION.—In the case of *Scott v. Royal Wax Co., Company*, before the Queen's Bench Division on Monday, April 10, judgment had been signed in default of appearance, and an application to Quain, J., at chambers, to set it aside had been referred by him to the court. The question was whether a foreign corporation that had no office in this country could be served with process out of the English courts. *R. E. Webster*, for the defendants, argued that ord. 11, r. 1, had not altered the practice theretofore existing as exemplified

in *Ingate v. The Austrian Lloyds* (4 C. B. N. S. 704). He referred to sections 18 and 19 of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, and contended that there was nothing in the Judicature Acts to give power to serve a foreign corporation abroad. He also maintained that the defendants were entitled to notice that the plaintiff had obtained an order to proceed against them by default. *Finlay*, for the plaintiff, maintained that a foreign corporation could be served with a writ or notice of a writ abroad under ord. 11, r. 1, though there was no express provision as to the manner of service; and cited *Daniel's Chancery Practice*, 2nd ed., p. 419; ord. 2, r. 4, and ord. 63, definition of "person"; and *Wilson's Judicature Acts*, p. 181. The court (Cockburn, C.J., Quain, J., and Pollock, B.) held that the service was good, and the judgment properly signed; but under the circumstances they gave leave to the defendants to come in and defend on payment of costs.

TRIAL BEFORE JUDGE WITH ASSESSORS.—In the case of *Sugg v. Silceer*, before the Queen's Bench Division on Monday, April 10, Archibald, J., had made an order, on the 27th of January, under ord. 36, r. 5, that the cause should be tried before a judge sitting with assessors. On the plaintiff's counsel coming before him to nominate the assessors, it appeared that the defendant had given notice under r. 3 of the same order for a trial by jury; whereupon Archibald, J., referred the matter to the court. *R. E. Webster*, for the plaintiff, contended that Archibald, J.'s, order had been made upon the merits under ord. 36, r. 6, and that r. 3 did not apply. *Aston, Q.C.*, and *Macrory*, argued that upon the general policy of the Acts of 1873 and 1875 trial by jury was carefully preserved where either party insisted upon that method. The court (Cockburn, C.J., Quain, J., and Pollock, B.) held that the defendant had a right, if he chose to insist upon it, to a trial by jury, and that his notice must stand good.

The Lord Chancellor, says the *Sheffield Independent*, has signified to Mr. John Webster that his name shall be added to the list of borough magistrates. Seven years ago Mr. Webster's name was included in a list submitted to the Government by the town council, but Lord Hatherley was of opinion that practising attorneys should not be appointed as magistrates, and he declined to accept Mr. Webster's name unless he would take it off the roll of attorneys, which he declined to do. The present Lord Chancellor acts upon a different rule, and thinks it necessary only to require that no attorney engaged in petty sessions practice shall act as a magistrate. We may therefore expect to see the borough bench reinforced by the strong common sense and legal knowledge of our friend Mr. Webster, to the no small gain of the public, and of his colleagues on the bench.

On Monday in the House of Commons, in answer to Mr. Ashley, the Attorney-General said that the question as to the propriety of a county court judge holding his sittings at the time when the county court office was directed to be closed would have been more fitly put to the Lord Chancellor, as the county court judge was a judicial officer, and was in no sense under the control of the Attorney-General. Speaking, however, as an individual, he might say that the practice of holding courts on days appointed for holidays for the clerks was one very much to be deprecated. He did not think a county court judge would do so without good and special reasons.

A curious case has recently arisen in Japan bearing on the press laws which exist in that country. A British subject claiming the rights of a free press, under the extra-territorial jurisdiction clause of our treaty, established a Japanese newspaper and began to circulate it. The press laws insist on the registration of a Japanese paper; this was unregistered. They control the expression of opinion; the proprietor of this journal claimed that he was liable to no such control. The Japanese represented to Sir Harry Parkes the anomaly and manifest injustice involved in this claim; and, feeling the justice and reason of the representation, Sir Harry issued a notification, in virtue of the powers vested in him by the Order in Council for China and Japan, making it penal for British subjects to publish newspapers in the Japanese language.

THE LAW OF RETAINER.

The question addressed to the Attorney-General on this subject, which, with his reply, we published last week, has naturally called the attention of the profession to a matter of great interest, not only to them, but to the public, the operation of which is not generally sufficiently understood.

The object of retainers, as we understand the system, is simply to determine which of two or more litigants is entitled to the services of any given barrister. It is, we think, a fundamental principle that every barrister is bound to act in every instance for the first comer, provided only the case be put before him in a recognized and legitimate manner, and that nothing is required of him inconsistent with his personal honour and integrity. A barrister may, it is true, impose at his pleasure—and risk—any exceptional terms he pleases, as those on which alone he will act for anybody; but he must apply the same rule impartially to all comers, and is bound not to relax his regulations in favour of any one litigant rather than another, either from personal considerations, or from any leaning in favour of either side of the question in dispute. It is easy to see how dangerous a weapon in the hands of a man, at once eminent and unscrupulous (and such men have not been altogether unknown in the history of the bar), any opportunity for personal selection or preference might readily become. This being so, and there being, in every department of advocacy, some men whose services are, or are supposed to be, of exceptional value, it inevitably follows that almost every suit gives rise to a race between the litigants, each endeavouring to be first with the particular gentleman supposed to be most desirable for that particular case.* This being so, nothing could be more natural than that, immediately upon the institution of an action, each party should send off to the particular leading counsel whose services he desired to secure, in order to make sure of him, without waiting for the natural time for the delivery of the first brief in the cause. This would probably have been effected at first by the delivery of a formal brief "to sign declaration" or for some similar object, but it would very soon have been apparent that a brief "to retain services" which would *avowedly* require nothing to be done for it, would have the same operation, so far as priority in the race was concerned, and need never carry more than a minimum fee, whereas any instructions on which action could possibly be taken, would or might require a larger one. Such a brief would, of course, be simply a retainer in effect, and would speedily have become so in form. So far, so good; and, except that we can see no excuse for the reckless manner in which retainers are given by some solicitors and in some divisions of the court,† there is nothing in the regulations as to special retainers which does not naturally arise out of the action of the ordinary rules of demand and supply, as applied to the particular business of advocacy.

But out of this rule has grown another, devised solely in the interest of a few counsel of exceptional eminence,

* It is a somewhat singular thing that this idea prevails quite as much with reference to actions in the Chancery and Admiralty Divisions as in cases to be tried before a jury. It is easy to understand how one or two men may have exceptional powers of persuasion when dealing with juries, but, except on the hypothesis that the bench are weaker than the bar, it is not reasonable to suppose that any one of the leaders in any court can be so superior to all the others as to make it worth while to pay an extra fee for the mere purpose of securing his advocacy when addressed to judges only; and there is always, in every court, a sufficient number of counsel conversant with the subject-matter to supply all the requirements of the parties without retainer.

† Take, for instance, the practice common in the Admiralty Division of giving a retainer *along with the brief*. Either the counsel has already received a retainer from the other side, in which case the retainer in question comes too late, or he has not, in which case it is, or ought to be, unnecessary (as the acceptance of the brief ought to operate as a retainer); in either case, therefore, it is a mere waste of money.

and a few litigants rich enough to "keep a barrister" of their own, which seems to us, not only unfair to the public, but, in the long run, prejudicial to the best interests of the profession. We mean the right of an expectant litigant, *ante litem motam*, by the expenditure of a greater or less sum of money,* to make sure of being first in the race for any particular counsel. This is what is meant by a general retainer, the operation of which is, as we understand it, to require the counsel to whom it has been given to refuse a special retainer from any one else until after the person on whose behalf the general retainer has been given has had and declined the option of giving a special retainer for himself. If, on notice that a retainer has been offered against him in any case, he does not immediately retain the counsel in that case, or if he afterwards suffer that special retainer to be discharged, his general retainer is gone; but it is new to us to hear it suggested that such a retainer carries with it any right on the part of the counsel retained analogous to that unquestionably given by a special retainer. The two cases are quite different: a special retainer ought not to be given unless the services of the particular counsel are wished for in the particular suit, and ought not to be made an engine for "stopping the mouths" of counsel; but a general retainer is merely a device for getting the start in the race for counsel, and we can see no reason why it should affect, or be affected by, any case where no such race has, in fact, taken place.

It will be seen that, in the particular case which has given rise to these remarks, we concur with the solicitors in opposition alike to the counsel's clerk and the opinion of the Attorney-General. This opinion, indeed, appears to us singularly unhappy. The contention of "Mr. B.'s" clerk would, if successful, have practically deprived the client for ever after of all power of selection of his counsel, no matter how various the matters about which he might be involved in litigation. *E.g.*, he might find himself a party to (1) An action on a bill of exchange; (2) A petition for winding up a limited company; (3) A proceeding for divorce; (4) An action for the recovery of land; (5) A "light and air case"; (6) A prosecution for conspiracy; (7) A "collision suit"; (8) An appeal from Scotland on a question of Scotch law; (9) A patent case; (10) An appeal from India; and (11) An action for taking the accounts of a mining partnership; and in every one of these he would be obliged to confine himself to the services of "Mr. B."—who could not possibly be a desirable man in all of them—unless he were able and willing to afford the somewhat unusual and expensive luxury of two leading counsel in those cases which were beyond the range—however extended—of "Mr. B.'s" special qualifications. The Attorney-General, in assenting generally to this view of the case, seems to have endeavoured to palliate its obvious monstrosity by introducing modifications, both of which we believe to be new, and each of which seems open to important objections. The first exception—that a separate retainer is required for the House of Lords and Privy Council—would have the following, we think absurd, result. Mr. A. has received a general retainer for Messrs. X. & Co. "in all courts." In an action of *W. v. X.*, Mr. A. is offered—and of course obliged to decline—a retainer for the plaintiff. He duly appears for the defendant and succeeds. The case is carried to the House of Lords, and the appellant, upon serving the petition of appeal on the respondent, offers Mr. A. a retainer in the House of Lords, which, if the Attorney-General is right, he is obliged to accept without giving his clients the option of a counter-retainer, and thereupon has to try and upset the judgment obtained by himself. We had always thought one of the

uses (such as they are) of a general retainer was to prevent the possibility of such a ridiculous travesty of forensic decency.

The other qualification of the rule introduced by the Attorney-General does indeed defy criticism, for it defies interpretation. What are the courts "in which a barrister usually practises"? If a general retainer were given to the Attorney-General, might he appear against the client in an action in the Chancery Division? He has occasionally held briefs in that division. Would a general retainer, given (say) to Mr. Roxburgh, extend only to the Rolls Court, or to the whole of the Chancery Division? If given to a member of the Northern Circuit, would it affect his London business in matters unconnected with the circuit? If given to a member of the chancery bar, who also belongs to and occasionally goes (say) the Western Circuit, will it prevent him from accepting a brief against the client at some town on the circuit where he never happens to have been before? Instances of this kind might be multiplied almost without end.

The truth is that general retainers are a mischievous excrescence, for which the only adequate reform is total abolition; but, if they are to be suffered to exist at all, they ought to be confined within the limits which custom has hitherto assigned to them, and which, by making them almost inoperative, render them comparatively innocuous; we cannot too strongly deprecate the idea of conferring on them the dangerous vitality lately conceived by the ingenuity of a Queen's Counsel's clerk, and which has, unhappily, received the sanction of the Attorney-General.

CONSOLIDATION OF MORTGAGES.

THE equitable doctrine of the consolidation of mortgages is one which has taken a definite and precise form within what, comparatively speaking, is a very recent period. In the older text-books on mortgages which are still in use the doctrine of consolidation seems to float about, as it were, on the outskirts of that of tacking, and the possession of the legal estate is therein still considered as an essential element. But the effect of the later cases has been to clear up, and, by clearing up, if not exactly to extend the limits of the doctrine, at any rate to show that it does extend over a much wider field than at one time it was thought to do.

Our object in the present article is to call attention to a recent and important decision by Vice-Chancellor Hall, namely, *Baker v. Gray* (24 W. R. 171, L. R. 1 Ch. D. 491), which draws a boundary line, hitherto apparently unnoticed, as against a consolidating mortgage. But before doing so it will be well to state very briefly the general law on the question.

Where a mortgagee holds two or more mortgages on two or more distinct properties belonging to the same mortgagor, the mortgagor, or those claiming under him, cannot redeem one without redeeming both or all; this is what is meant by saying that the mortgagee may consolidate his securities. The mortgages sought to be consolidated may be either legal or equitable, or some may be legal and some equitable, and the properties may be either personal or real, or some may be personal and some real. The mortgagee may have acquired the mortgages he seeks to consolidate from different original mortgagees, and he will not be prevented from consolidating by the fact that he has acquired one or more of his mortgages when affected with notice of subsequent incumbrancers. For example, let us suppose that A. is the owner of Whiteacre and also of Blackacre, and that he has mortgaged Whiteacre to X. and Blackacre to Y., and that, by way of second mortgage, he has mortgaged Whiteacre to P. Now, although X. may have distinct notice of P.'s mortgage, he may, nevertheless, by taking a transfer of Y.'s mortgage, put P. in this position that P. cannot redeem Whiteacre alone, but must, if he redeem at all, redeem both Whiteacre and

* We believe that the precise amount is matter of dispute; it is ordinarily understood to be ten guineas, but there is at least one firm of solicitors who maintain that, at common law, five guineas is the right amount, and we know of at least one instance in which this sum was tendered and accepted.

Blackacre. The hardship this may be on P. is very plain, but it may be useful to take a set of figures. Suppose, then, that Whiteacre is worth £1,000, and that X's mortgage on it is for £500, and P.'s also for £500; and let Blackacre be worth £1,000 and be mortgaged to Y. for £1,500. Now, the two estates together are worth £2,000 exactly, and X. may, therefore, safely take a transfer of Y.'s mortgage if he can rely on both estates for his own £500 and Y.'s £1,500, and this he can do by the doctrine under consideration. Meanwhile what is P.'s position? He cannot redeem Whiteacre without redeeming also Blackacre—that is, he must pay the £2,000, the full value of the estates; so that, as far as the two estates are concerned, he is left absolutely without security for his £500. This, of course, is an extreme case, but it exemplifies the hardship of the doctrine on a second mortgagee. When, to what we have said, it is added that P.'s position would be the same if, instead of being a mortgagee of Whiteacre, he were the absolute purchaser of the equity of redemption in Whiteacre, and that the same rule as to consolidation applies, whether the consolidating mortgagee is proceeding to foreclose his securities or is proceeded against by way of a suit for redemption, we believe that the entire doctrine of consolidation of mortgages, as understood before the decision of the recent case of *Baker v. Gray*, has been set forth.

The limitation of the doctrine laid down in the recent case may be put thus:—A mortgagee cannot consolidate mortgages of two distinct properties as against a subsequent mortgagee of one of them, if, at the time when the security on the other property was first created in his favour, he had notice of the existence of the subsequent mortgage. The case was very fully argued, and, contrary to what would appear from the report in the *Law Reports*, the judgment was, in effect, a reserved and considered one. The case was almost completely argued on the 22nd of November, and was completed on the 3rd of December, and the Vice-Chancellor in the meantime "gave a good deal of consideration to the question" and "looked into the authorities for himself" (see 24 W. R. p. 171 and p. 173). The result of the researches of counsel and judge was that, with the exception of *Tussell v. Smith* (6 W. R. 803, 2 De G. & J. 713), all the reported cases in point were found to be cases of the consolidation of mortgages created prior in point of time to the mortgage or sale as against which consolidation was sought. And *Tussell v. Smith* was distinguished by the learned Vice-Chancellor on the ground that there, when the mortgage on what may be called the second property was executed in favour of the mortgagee on the first property, such mortgagee had not had notice of the second mortgage on the first property. The case was clearly put by the Vice-Chancellor during the hearing (see 22 W. R. p. 172):—"I understand the argument to be that there is no case of consolidation . . . when the holder of the securities sought to be consolidated had, at the time of taking his security upon the second property, notice of the second charge upon the first property. The principle upon which consolidation has been allowed is stated by Vice-Chancellor Wood in *Bevor v. Luck* (15 W. R. 1221, L. R. 4 Eq. 537), where he says that a transfer of the right of redemption is subject to the equities to which the mortgagor was subject, meaning clearly the equities to which the transferor was subject at the time of the transfer. A second mortgagee should ask the mortgagor, 'Have you any other property, and have you mortgaged it?' He cannot make inquiry as to non-existent charges."

The extract just given explains the decision; but we may be allowed to caution the reader that it will be possible to draw too wide a deduction from it, and also from the judgment. The recent case decides this, and this alone, namely, that a mortgagee of Whiteacre cannot himself, as against a subsequent mortgagee of Whiteacre, consolidate his mortgage with a mortgage of Blackacre, provided this latter mortgage was made in his favour

after he received notice of the subsequent mortgage of Whiteacre. But it by no means follows, at any rate where the first mortgage of Whiteacre is a legal mortgage, that such mortgage can, under no circumstances, be consolidated with a mortgage on Blackacre created after the prior mortgagee on Whiteacre received notice of the subsequent mortgage on that property. The analogy of tacking would lead to the inference that any subsequent mortgagee of Blackacre without notice could take a transfer of the prior mortgage of Whiteacre, and consolidate it with his own, notwithstanding that the prior mortgagee of Whiteacre had notice of the subsequent mortgage thereon. When the question is one of tacking, notice given by the second to the first mortgagee will not prevent the third mortgagee, who lends his money without notice of the second mortgage, from obtaining a transfer of and tacking his mortgage to the first. The case of *Baker v. Gray* can stand along with *Tussell v. Smith* only on the ground of notice, and the instance of tacking shows that notice to a first mortgagee is not effectual to stamp, as it were, his mortgage itself with notice so as to pass into the hands of transferees all the equities and disabilities to which the original holder was subject.

If the view thus suggested is correct, then, notwithstanding the recent case, a second mortgagee or purchaser of the equity of redemption cannot, under any circumstances, or by the exercise of any amount of care, absolutely insure himself against the application to his security or purchase of the doctrine of consolidation in favour of charges not in existence at the time when he takes his security or conveyance; so that in this respect, as well as others, the words of Vice-Chancellor Wood in *Bevor v. Luck* still remain true:—"It is a very dangerous thing at any time to buy equities of redemption, or to deal with them at all."

Recent Decisions.

THE SETTLED ESTATES ACTS.

(*Taylor v. Taylor*, M.R., 23 W. R. 947, L. R. 20 Eq. 297; *Ex parte Taylor*, M.R., L. R. 1 Ch. D. 426.)

In the latter of these cases two questions arising upon the Settled Estates Acts were determined which the practitioner ought to note. Section 2 of the original Act (19 & 20 Vict. c. 120) enables the court, "if it shall deem it proper and consistent with a due regard for the interests of all parties entitled under the settlement, and subject to the provisions and restrictions in this Act contained, to authorize leases of any settled estates." Section 16 provides that "any person entitled to the possession or to the receipt of the rents and profits of any settled estates for a term of years determinable on his death, or for an estate for life, or any greater estate may apply to the court, by petition in a summary way, to exercise the powers conferred by this Act." In the last-mentioned case the question was raised whether section 2 enables the court to grant a power of leasing, although there is no one entitled to petition under section 16. The person who in the previous case of *Taylor v. Taylor* was held not to be entitled to the possession or to the receipt of the rents and profits of the settled estates within that section, now applied to have a leasing power vested in a trustee, and contended that, as by section 2 a general power was given to the court to authorize leases of settled estates, it must have been intended that this power should be exercised independently of the existence of any person coming within the description in section 16 of the persons who may apply by petition. The Master of the Rolls promptly repudiated this view, pointing out that by section 2 the power was to be exercised according to the provisions of the Act, and that one of those provisions was that an application should be made in a

certain way, and by certain persons; that, even independently of these words, a statute which confers a new power upon a court, and at the same time points out a mode of its exercise, must be taken to mean that it must be exercised in that way, and in that way only; and that, on principle, the Legislature could not have intended to enable a remote remainderman to petition for the sale or lease of an estate with the management of which he has, at the time, nothing to do. The reasoning seems very strong, and if authority were needed his lordship might have found it in the decision of his predecessor in *Harvey v. Clark* (25 Beav. 7), where Lord Romilly seems to have thought that, even where a suit is pending, a petition must be presented to obtain the exercise of the powers conferred by the Act on the court. If the order under the Act could only be made upon petition, it follows that it could only be made upon petition by the persons named in section 16.

The other point decided in the recent case was one of more difficulty. The Amendment Act of 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 33, s. 3) empowers the court to dispense with the concurrence of the persons required by section 17 of the original Act to concur in every application to the court, but it provides that "the court, in considering the application, shall have regard to the number of persons who concur in or consent to the application, and who dissent therefrom"; "and to the estates or interests which such persons respectively have, or claim to have, in the estate as to which such application is made." This clause was added to Mr. Gregory's measure in the House of Lords, and it is a little surprising that the learned lord at whose suggestion it was inserted did not perceive that it was certain from its indefiniteness to lead to doubt and perhaps to conflict of judicial practice. In the recent case the survivor of two persons—a man aged forty-three, and a woman aged sixty-one—would become absolutely entitled to the freehold and leasehold property which was the subject of the application. The man dissented from the application, and the Master of the Rolls held that the order ought not to be made. He expressed an opinion that the power conferred by the new statute was not "that the court should decide simply according to its own notion of what would be best to be done with the property"; that it was only in cases of the dissent of persons comparatively "unimportant as regards value or interest in the estate" that the court ought to exercise the power; and that it ought not to be exercised when the persons are equal in number, and so closely equal in the value of interest as was the case in *Ex parte Taylor*. Hence it would appear that the duty of the judge in deciding upon the exercise of the power conferred by the original Act in cases falling within the amending Act of 1874 is somewhat complicated. He must first satisfy himself that the proposed lease or sale is consistent with a due regard for the interests of all parties entitled under the settlement; for upon this the exercise of the power is primarily dependent. Having satisfied himself that the proposed lease will be advantageous to all parties, he has next to decide whether the lease is to be granted, first by ascertaining whether the number of persons assenting or dissenting predominates, and next by weighing the relative importance of their interests. If the dissents outnumber and outweigh the assents the court must not act. In the recent case the numbers were equal and the values not very unequal, and even in this event it appears the court is to hold its hand. But what is to be done if the numbers are one way and the value the other? The clause added in the Lords appears to attach equal weight to each; but the observations of the Master of the Rolls seem to indicate that he would have little difficulty in giving the preference to the value.

Reviews.

PUBLIC HEALTH.

THE LAW RELATING TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AS CONTAINED IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1875, AND OTHER STATUTES. By GERALD A. R. FITZGERALD, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons.

Mr. FitzGerald tells us in his preface that he was employed by the Government in the preparation of the Public Health Act of 1875, so that we are led to expect a work of more than average execution. Before pronouncing an opinion, we will explain shortly his manner of treatment. We have first a short history of sanitary legislation, which closes with the recent Act, and notices more particularly the amendments of the law which it effected. Then follows the Act of 1875 in *extenso*, "with references to all the cases of importance" decided on corresponding sections of former statutes. We next have such provisions of the Waterworks Clauses Acts, &c., as are incorporated by the Act of 1875. Four appendices follow, being (1) the enactments relating to audit of the Poor Law Acts; (2) "miscellaneous statutes"; (3) orders of the Local Government Board; and (4) a table of the "Sanitary Acts."

We agree with Mr. FitzGerald that without some knowledge of the previous statutes the Act of 1875 cannot easily be understood. The history is well traced, and the distinctions between the leading statutes are clearly marked. It would have been better, however, to group together in one or two sentences the absolutely new portion of the Act of 1875 instead of noticing it in the review of the "parts" over which it is scattered. Coming to the *pièce de resistance* in the shape of "the Acts," we may say that the effect of the cases cited is generally well given, and the notes, though brief, are always clear. The cases referred to number only about 200, as against about 1,000 cited by a previous writer on the same subject. We are far from reckoning the paucity of cases as a defect, if all the important cases are noticed. Nothing is easier than to rake together all the cases from the various digests; nothing more difficult than to weigh and discriminate their relative importance. Mr. FitzGerald explains in his preface his mode of treatment thus:—"Where a definite proposition of law can be extracted from a case, I have always endeavoured to state it; in other instances, I have indicated what appeared to be the point of the cases; occasionally, where the circumstances of a case are special, or would require a detailed statement, I have merely cited it." The fault we have to find is, not with the statement of the cases, but with the occasional omission of cases of considerable importance. Thus, under section 15, we miss the important case of *Hammond v. Vestry of St. Pancras* (22 W. R. 826, L. R. 9 C. P. 316), in which, under a similar section of the Metropolitan Management Act of 1855, the duty of a vestry with respect to the drains under its charge was elaborately discussed by Brett, J. Mr. FitzGerald's note is—

"Action against local authority for damage occasioned by interruption of sewage owing to defective construction of their sewers (*Brown v. Sargent*, 1 F. & F. 112)."

Again, at section 264, which deals with actions against local authorities or their officers, and with notice of action, we have a bare reference to three cases, of which *Selmes v. Judge* (19 W. R. 1110, L. R. 6 Q. B. 724) is one, "as to notice of action." We should have expected a reference, and more than a reference, to *Mill v. Hawker* (23 W. R. 26, 348), in which the Court of Exchequer decided that the individual members of a highway board were liable for the acts of the board.

The abbreviated references to former Acts given in the marginal notes are apparently taken from the print of the Bill, and are probably worth preserving, but, considering the enormous length of some of the sections, it is a question whether the space occupied by them might

not have been better devoted to the insertion of additional marginal notes proper. The effect of the incorporated statutes should, we think, have been given in the notes to the sections incorporating them. With regard to these statutes themselves, as well as the miscellaneous statutes, the only thing which we have to observe upon is the almost complete absence of explanatory notes.

The index is full and analytical, and contains references to sections of the statutes as well as to pages. Here the system of "abbreviated references" has been very happily employed, for, by the use of a few well-chosen initial letters, Mr. Fitzgerald has been able to refer his reader to no less than five different Acts.

QUARTER SESSIONS.

THE JURISDICTION AND PRACTICE OF QUARTER SESSIONS IN OTHER THAN CRIMINAL MATTERS. The Second Edition of Leeming and Cross. By HORATIO LLOYD, Recorder of Chester, Judge of County Courts, and Deputy-Chairman of Quarter Sessions for Cheshire, and HENRY FREDERICK THURLOW, Barrister-at-Law. H. Sweet; Stevens & Sons.

One of the authors of "Leeming and Cross" is now a Secretary of State, and enjoys the curious literary honour of having the second edition of his own book dedicated to himself. The work was first published in 1858, and soon acquired a high reputation. Its plan may be told in a few words. "The object of it" (as stated in the preface) "was simply to bring together all the duties of justices in sessions only, with the exception of those connected with the criminal law." With these objects in view, the authors, after a preliminary notice of the origin of quarter sessions, treated, first of the original, and then of the appellate, jurisdiction, the method being to give the effect and not the words of the numerous statutes, and also the effect of the decisions, these latter being in most cases admirably treated. A very useful "Table of Appeals in Particular Cases" concluded the book.

Such being the material on which the editors had to work, we have next to inquire in what way they have performed their task. To weave in the substance of the ninety statutes, or thereabouts (see the table of statutes cited), which have affected the subject more or less since 1858 is no light labour. The Highway Act of 1862, the numerous Public Health Acts which culminated last session in the Consolidating Act of 1875, the Adulteration Act of 1875, the Bastardy Act of 1872, and last, though not least, the numerous Licensing Acts up to 1874, appear, with one or two exceptions, to have all been noted up in their proper places, and usually with the terseness which was a leading characteristic of the original work. We find, however, no notice of the Employers and Workmen Act, 1875, or of 23 Vict. c. 27, s. 34, which, notwithstanding the repeal *quoad* the sale of liquor effected by the Licensing Act of 1872, still gives an appeal to quarter sessions *quoad* a refreshment-house keeper not licensed for the sale of liquor, or not committing an offence connected with such sale (see section 75 and schedule of the Licensing Act of 1872). And we observe that the editors have not taken upon themselves to shorten, as we think they might have done in some cases, the *verbatim* extracts from statutes which appeared in the former edition. For instance, 22 Hen. 8, c. 5, s. 4, relating to repairs of bridges—which occupies a whole page—is given at full length. So also is 55 Geo. 3, c. 143, s. 1, on the same subject; also 7 Will. 4 & 1 Vict. c. 19, s. 1, as to the appointment of an assistant barrister by a recorder. If the very words were necessary, which we much doubt, it would still have been well to preface them by a short statement of their effect. We read, too, with a little surprise, that justices are entitled to 4s. a day each by 12 Ric. 2, c. 10, dukes being excepted by 14 Ric. 2, c. 12, whereas so much of those venerable statutes as confers this ample *honorarium* was repealed by 18 & 19 Vict. c. 126, s. 21.

With regard to the cases, we miss *Reg. v. Haslingfield Overseers* (22 W. R. 260, L. R. 9 Q. B. 203), an important case bearing on the authority of a quarter sessions table of fees, and *Reg. v. Farguhar* (L. R. 9 Q. B. 258), in which a *mandamus* was granted to justices to hold an adjourned licensing meeting; but we have been successful in finding such other notable cases as we have looked for.

On the editing of a work of this kind a thoroughly trustworthy judgment can only be founded upon the results of actual use and frequent reference. We may say, however, that the general plan of the work, which was excellent, is well kept up. It remains compact and conveniently arranged, and on these accounts it is probable that it will obtain the same popularity as the former edition had. We must add, however, that the result of our perusal is an impression that the editors in filling up details have not done quite as much as might have been expected of them.

LOCUS STANDI REPORTS.

LOCUS STANDI REPORTS. Vol. I. part 1. By F. CLIFFORD, and A. G. RICKARDS, Barristers-at-Law. Butterworths.

We are glad to observe that the reports of "Clifford and Stevens"—of which we had occasion to speak favourably on their first appearance some years back—are to be continued in a "new series." The present volume contains cases decided by the Court of Referees during the sessions 1873-4-5. The authors state that they have omitted "cases depending mainly upon questions of competition, construction of agreements, or other special circumstances, and involving no definite principle." In but few cases, however, have we discovered a general proposition in a head-note. These notes usually consist only of an abstract of the facts, and of the ruling of the court, and, although occasionally, to our thinking, too long (see pp. 57, 73), they are clearly framed. The reports themselves are remarkably well done, and will be found to contain matters of interest to other than parliamentary practitioners. For instance, the relation of *Hammersmith Railway Company v. Brand* (L. R. 4 H. L. 171) to *locus standi* is noticed in the case of *Metropolitan Railway* (p. 46), in which 238 owners of house property (not intended to be taken) were allowed a *locus*, in respect of expected "injury from vibration, noise, and smoke, and so on." From the same case it appears that the promoters were armed with a clause dispensing with the much-versed section 92 of the Lands Clauses Act, 1845. It is curious that the court scarcely ever gives reasons for its judgments, so that the ground of the decision is to be sought from interlocutory observations. The index is very good, but the "running heads," which usher in the head-notes, seem to be too numerous. In one case (p. 122) we have counted twenty-seven of these. Reporters, and indeed all legal writers, should take care not to bury their really important points beneath a crowd of comparatively unimportant ones. To parliamentary practitioners the work cannot fail to be of great value.

The Lord Chancellor will not hold this year his customary reception of the judges and Queen's Counsel at Easter.

The High Court of Justice at Athens delivered its sentence on Wednesday upon the ex-Ministers, archbishops, and others impeached on charges of corruption and simony. M. Balassopoulou, former Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, is condemned to one year's imprisonment, deprived of political rights for three years, and ordered to give the £2,000 he received as bribes to the poor-house. M. Nicolopoulou, former Minister of Justice, is sentenced to ten months' imprisonment. Each bishop is fined double the amount he received in bribes; the Archbishop of Cephalonia to pay £2,000, the Archbishop of Patras £850, and the Archbishop of Messene £800.

Notes.

IN *Re Lister*, heard by the Chief Judge on Monday, April 10, a question arose as to the power of the court to disallow the remuneration awarded by creditors to a trustee in bankruptcy in a case where the comptroller in bankruptcy has reported to the court that the trustee has failed to observe some of the requirements imposed on him by the statute and rules. Section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, gives to the creditors assembled at a general meeting power to appoint a trustee of the property of the bankrupt at such remuneration as they may from time to time determine; and, by section 55, it is provided that "the trustee, having had his quarterly statement of accounts audited by the committee of inspection, shall, within the prescribed time, forward the certified statement in the prescribed form to the Comptroller in Bankruptcy, and if he fail to do so he shall be deemed guilty of a contempt of court." Section 83, sub-section 4, gives the creditors power, by special resolution passed at a meeting called for the purpose, to remove the trustee and appoint another. R. 121 provides that, where a trustee is removed prior to obtaining his release, the creditors shall determine what, if any, remuneration shall be paid for the services which he may have rendered. R. 243 provides that the trustee is to keep a book, to be entitled the "Estate-Book," in which he is to enter from day to day the receipts and payments made by him. This book (r. 245-6) is to be audited quarterly by the committee of inspection, who are to certify the book and a copy of it. The trustee (r. 247) is forthwith, after the audit, to transmit to the comptroller the copy so certified. And r. 251 provides that "the comptroller shall take cognizance of the conduct of trustees, and in the event of any trustee not faithfully performing his duties, and duly observing all the requirements imposed on him by statute, rules, or otherwise, relative to the performance of his duties, or in the event of any complaint being made to the comptroller by any creditor in regard thereto, he shall inquire into the same, and, if not satisfied with the explanation given, he shall report thereon to the court, which, after hearing the trustee, may remove him from his office, or otherwise make such order in the matter as the justice of the case may require." In *Re Lister* the creditors resolved in October to remove the trustee, and appointed another in his place, and at the same time sanctioned the payment to the removed trustee of the sum of £30 which the committee of inspection had awarded him by way of remuneration for his services. In December the comptroller reported to the court that the removed trustee had failed to transmit to him the certified copy of his estate-book, which was due in the previous October, and had not, upon being required to do so, given a satisfactory explanation of his conduct. The trustee was then summoned by the court to explain why he had failed to comply with the requisition of the comptroller, and the judge thereupon ordered that the certified copy should be transmitted to the comptroller within fourteen days, and that the trustee should be disallowed all remuneration for his services. The trustee appealed from the latter part of the order, which had been made by the judge without any application on the part of the comptroller or any of the creditors, and it was urged that, the creditors having voted the remuneration, the court had no jurisdiction to disallow it. The Chief Judge, however, held that the court had full power to make the order. The creditors, he said, must be taken to have voted the remuneration on the implied condition that the trustee would faithfully discharge the duties imposed on him by the statute, and as he had not complied with this condition his remuneration had been properly disallowed by the judge. This case affords a useful illustration of the jurisdiction which the court exercises over trustees.

WE FIND in a recent issue of the *Scottish Journal of Jurisprudence* a report of a case of *Allan v. Angus* decided in the Sheriff Court of Linlithgow, by Sheriff Munro, in which the town clerk of Bathgate sued the defender, the chief magistrate of Bathgate, for a sum alleged to be incurred by the defender on account of the pursuer's services at a contested election of commissioners. The sheriff-substitute decided in favour of the town clerk, and the sheriff-principal, on the case being appealed, adhered to the judgment of

his substitute, pronouncing the following interlocutor:—"Edinburgh, 20th January, 1876.—The sheriff having heard parties' procurators orally, and made *avizandum* and considered the cause, adheres to the S.-S.'s interlocutor of 10th December last, and dismisses the defender's appeal and decerns.—GEO. MUNRO." To this interlocutor the sheriff added a note, of which the following is the important portion:—"It is not disputed that the defender was the returning officer at the election of commissioners for Bathgate on the occasion, in August, 1875, here in question, and that he employed the pursuer to do various things necessary for the election. One of the pleas in defence is that the pursuer, as town clerk of Bathgate, was bound to do all those things as covered by his salary; but no proof was offered that the terms of his appointment included such duties, and these duties appear to be laid by statute on the returning officer, but with relief to him from funds of the municipality. By the Ballot Act, s. 20, sub-section 3, 'the returning officer is to provide in municipal elections everything which in parliamentary elections is required to be provided by the returning officer for the purpose of a poll'; and by sub-section 4, 'all expenses shall be defrayed in manner provided by law with respect to the expenses of a municipal election.' We are thus directed to find what things are, under the Ballot Act, to be provided by the returning officer in parliamentary elections. Now, by section 3, 'the returning officer in parliamentary elections is to provide such nomination papers, polling stations, ballot boxes, ballot papers, stamping instruments, copies of register of voters, and other things, appoint and pay such officers, and do such other acts and things as may be necessary for effectually conducting an election in manner provided by this Act.' What he provides he must pay for; and if he takes professional assistance the same principle applies."

General Correspondence.

COMMISSIONERS FOR AFFIDAVITS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Is it sufficient for a commissioner, on swearing an affidavit in any division of the High Court of Justice, to sign after his name "A commissioner, &c.," without setting out the long full-length title or description in thirteen words of "A commissioner to administer oath in the Supreme Court of Judicature in England"?

Under the Common Law Procedure Acts it was sufficient, where the affidavit was intitled in any common law court, to say "A commissioner, &c.," only, although in Chancery and the Probate and Matrimonial Courts the old full-length title was always used.

In the hurry of swearing bankruptcy and county court affidavits especially it is a great trouble to write the full title, and I should be glad to know if there is any decision or practice in the Courts in London allowing the use of the shorter or contracted description.

A COUNTRY COMMISSIONER.

[The very abbreviated form suggested ("A commissioner, &c.") would not be accepted as of course in any of the London offices. It may have been accepted in some few cases of great emergency, but we know that, in the Chancery Division at least, such abbreviated form has been invariably rejected as being altogether too ambiguous in its conciseness. Unquestionably, the form of words most acceptable and appropriate is:—"A commissioner to administer oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature in England." The following form has, however, been accepted:—"A commissioner to take oaths in the Supreme Court."—Ed. S. J.]

JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Seeing that by the new practice it is necessary to file a copy of the writ of summons and indorsement thereon on issuing the original, is it necessary, on signing judgment in default of appearance to either an eight-day or a twelve-day writ, to do so over again?

In the district registry where I practise, the registrar does not require a second copy on signing judgment by de-

fault on an eight-day writ, but does under a twelve-day (Bill of Exchange procedure) one, holding that as the practice under the "summary procedure on Bills of Exchange Act, 1855," requires a copy of the writ of summons to be filed with the affidavit of service (it need not be annexed or verified), he is bound still to do so, though admitting the uselessness of it. Surely there must be a practice by this time established in the London offices of the court?

A "S. S. C."

[See remarks under the head "The New Practice."—*Ed. S. J.*]

Obituary.

MR. JOHN JAMES SIMPSON.

Mr. John James Simpson, solicitor, of Derby, died at his residence at Quorndon, Derbyshire, on the 16th ult., after about a month's illness. Mr. Simpson was the eldest son of Mr. James Blythe Simpson, and was admitted a solicitor in 1846, when he went into partnership with his father and with Mr. Benjamin Frear. After his father's death about eighteen years ago, he was joined by Mr. William Grinwood Taylor, who had previously been his London agent, and the firm (formerly known as Simpson & Frear) became Simpson & Taylor; and it was afterwards joined by Mr. Alfred Robert Simpson, the brother of the senior, and Mr. Adolphus Grinwood Taylor, the son of the junior partner. On the passing of the Probate Act in 1857, Mr. Simpson was appointed district probate registrar for Derby, and he was also clerk to the Commissioners of Land and Assessed Taxes for the Merleston and Litchwich divisions, registrar of the Ecclesiastical Courts of Dale Abbey and Talke Abbey, clerk to the Derby Gas Company and several local turnpike trusts, and steward of several ecclesiastical and other manors. Mr. Simpson was a Conservative in politics and took an active part in many local contests. He had been several times Under-Sheriff of Derbyshire. His younger brother, Mr. Alfred Robert Simpson, died only eight days before him.

MR. JOHN YOUNG MELMOTH.

Mr. John Young Melmoth, solicitor, of Sherborne, died a few days ago, after a long and painful illness. Mr. Melmoth was the son of Mr. James Proctor Melmoth, solicitor. He was admitted in 1830, and had ever since practised at Sherborne, having been during the last few years in partnership with Mr. Charles Leftwich Oldfield Bartlett. He had a large private practice, and was a perpetual commissioner for Dorsetshire and Somersetshire, and a commissioner for affidavits in all the courts. He held several public offices, having been clerk to the county magistrates, to the Commissioners of Taxes, to the Sherborne Board of Guardians, Local Board of Health, and Highway Board, and to the stewards of the alms-houses; also coroner for the liberty of Sherborne, superintendent registrar, and vestry clerk. He was most assiduous in the performance of all his official duties, and took a warm interest in all matters of local interest. He was a governor of the Sherborne Grammar School, to the welfare of which he devoted much time and attention. Mr. Melmoth was buried in his family vault in the Sherborne Cemetery, the funeral being attended by all the masters of the grammar school, the members of the local board of health, and many other neighbours who were desirous of showing their respect to his memory.

MR. HENRY JOHN COLEMAN.

Mr. Henry John Coleman, solicitor, town clerk of Pontefract, died at his residence, Ropergate, Pontefract, on the 27th ult., in his seventy-third year. Mr. Coleman was the son of Mr. James Coleman, solicitor. He was born in 1804, and was admitted a solicitor in 1829. He at once went into partnership with his father, on whose death he succeeded to the town clerkship of Pontefract, which he held up to the time of his death. He was also clerk to the borough magistrates and Commissioners of Taxes, and to the Doncaster and Leeds Turnpike Trusts. He was in 1857 appointed registrar of the Pontefract County Court (Circuit No. 14), but was recently succeeded in that office

by his partner, Mr. John William Sangster. Mr. Coleman was also a perpetual commissioner for the West Riding of Yorkshire, and a commissioner for taking affidavits. He had for a long time been in delicate health and unable to discharge his public duties, but his death was rather sudden.

MR. JOHN BILLINGSLEY PARRY, Q.C.

Mr. John Billingsley Parry, Q.C., many years a judge of county courts, died at Brighton on the 27th ult., at the age of seventy-seven. Mr. Parry was the second son of Mr. James Parry, of Preston, Shropshire, by the only daughter of Mr. John Billingsley, of Yeaton, and was born in 1798. He was educated at Shrewsbury School, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1824. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1844, and on the passing of the County Courts Act in 1847 he was appointed by Lord Cottenham to the judgeship of the county courts for circuit No. 36, comprising Oxfordshire, and parts of Berkshire and other counties. He discharged his judicial duties in a very efficient manner, and enjoyed the confidence of suitors and the respect of the legal profession. In October, 1874, after more than twenty-seven years' service, the state of his health necessitated his resignation, and he retired on a pension. Mr. Parry was a bencher of Lincoln's-inn and a magistrate for Oxfordshire and Berkshire. He was twice married—in 1824, to the daughter of Mr. John Fane, M.P. for Oxfordshire, and in 1847, to the daughter of the late Sir William Rawson.

MR. GABRIEL STONE POOLE.

Mr. Gabriel Stone Poole, solicitor, died at the Manor House, Bridgewater, on the 25th ult., after an illness of several months. Mr. Poole was a member of an old Somersetshire family. He was admitted a solicitor in 1832, and had ever since carried on business at Bridgewater, having been for many years in partnership with Mr. Joseph Rascombe Poole. He was a perpetual commissioner for Somersetshire, and though he did not hold any public appointment the private business of his firm was very large. Mr. Poole took a warm interest in all religious and educational undertakings. He was well known in the district as chairman of the Finance Committee of the Bath and West of England Agricultural Society, to the interests of which body he devoted much time and labour. He was attacked with illness immediately on his return from the meeting of the Diocesan Conference at Wells in October last. Paralysis of the brain and epilepsy supervened, and he had ever since been unable to attend to business. He was buried at Brent on the 28th ult.

MR. HENRY HIME.

Mr. Henry Hime, solicitor, senior registrar of the Liverpool County Court, died at his residence, 24, Parkfield-road, Liverpool, on Saturday, April 1, in his seventieth year. Mr. Hime was born in 1807, was admitted a solicitor in 1829, and had ever since practised in Liverpool. In 1860 he was appointed registrar of the Liverpool County Court (Circuit No. 6), which office he held up to the time of his death, Mr. James Foster Watson being his colleague. At the sitting of the court, Mr. Henry Hodgson Bremner, the senior counsel present, said that he had been asked by several members of the profession to express their regret at Mr. Hime's death, and to bear testimony to his public and private worth, and the satisfactory manner in which he had performed his important official duties. Every practitioner in the court had noticed with admiration the great solicitude and earnestness with which he discharged his functions, and to suitors and others who had business at the court he showed the greatest kindness and consideration. Mr. William Lowe, solicitor, expressed his concurrence in what Mr. Bremner had said. The presiding judge (Mr. Perronet Thompson) said that he was not surprised at the remarks which had been made. To himself and his colleague the loss would be even more serious than to the profession. They had found Mr. Hime to be every thing they could desire as a registrar. The funeral took place on Wednesday, April 6, at the Smithdown-lane

Cemetery, and was attended by most of the Liverpool solicitors, and by many members of the Northern Circuit. Mr. Perronet Thompson was also present, but his colleague (Mr. J. F. Collier) was prevented from attending by the sitting of the St. Helen's Court.

MR. WILLIAM BROOKS GATES.

Mr. William Brooks Gates, solicitor, proctor, and notary, died at his residence in St. Giles-street, Northampton, on the 2nd inst., at the age of fifty-three. Mr. Gates was born in 1823; was admitted a solicitor in 1844, and immediately went into partnership with his father, Mr. William Gates, to whom he had been articled, and on whose death in 1867 he succeeded to the post of deputy-registrar for the diocese of Peterborough and the archdeaconry of Northampton. In 1859 he was appointed by the late Sir Cresswell Cresswell to be district registrar of the Court of Probate. He discharged all his official duties with great efficiency and courtesy, and his private practice was very large. He took a warm interest in all local matters, and he had been for a long time connected with the corporation of Northampton, first as a councillor, and afterwards as an alderman. He was chairman of the Sanitary Committee of the corporation, in which capacity his legal knowledge and sound judgment proved extremely valuable. Mr. Gates was a munificent supporter of all the local charities. He occupied an influential position in the Masonic body, having served as Provincial Grand Treasurer for Northamptonshire. He was buried on Friday, the 7th inst., at St. Giles's Church, Northampton, the funeral being attended by many Freemasons and members of the corporation, and by several of his private friends.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. WILLIAM ALDAM, barrister, of Frickley Hall, Doncaster, has been elected Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the West Riding of Yorkshire. Mr. Aldam is the eldest son of Mr. William Aldam, of Frickley Hall, and was born in 1813. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was fourth wrangler in 1836, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1839. Mr. Aldam was formerly a member of the Northern Circuit, and he represented Leeds in the Liberal interest from 1841 till 1847. He has been for several years deputy-chairman of the sessions.

Mr. CHARLES MYLNE BARKER, solicitor, of 15, Bedford-row, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature in England.

Mr. CHARLES LEFTWICH OLDFIELD BARTLETT, solicitor, of Sherborne, has been elected Clerk to the Sherborne Burial Board, in the place of his partner, the late Mr. John Young Melmoth. Mr. Bartlett was admitted a solicitor in 1848.

Mr. BENJAMIN BONNER, solicitor, proctor, and notary, of Gloucester, has been appointed by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol to be Registrar of the ancient Diocese of Gloucester, in the place of Mr. Thomas Holt, resigned. Mr. Bonner was admitted a solicitor in 1852, and is also secretary to the bishop and deputy registrar of the archdeaconry of Bristol.

Mr. RICHARD CLARENCE HALSE, solicitor (of the firm of Halse, Trustram, & Co.), of 61, Cheapside, and 176, Holland-road, Kensington, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the County of Middlesex and the Cities of London and Westminster.

Mr. CHARLES MANN, Q.C., of Adelaide, has been appointed Attorney-General of the Colony of South Australia in succession to the Hon. Samuel James Way, Q.C., appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

The Hon. SAMUEL JAMES WAY, Q.C., Attorney-General of the Colony of South Australia, who has been appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of that colony, in succession to the late Sir Richard Davies Hanson, has practised for several years in Adelaide as a solicitor and notary public. He is a member of the House of Assembly, and one of her Majesty's Counsel for the colony.

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society at the Law Institution on Tuesday last (Mr. Rouse in the chair), the following resolution was carried:—"That a committee of five members be appointed to consider Lord Selborne's Bill to establish a General School of Law, and to report to the society, and to frame a petition to Parliament upon the subject of the said Bill."—The society then proceeded to the discussion of the following question:—"Ought Mr. Norwood's Bill proposing to make barristers liable for negligence and to enable them to sue for their fees to become law?" Mr. Muntion opened in the affirmative, Messrs. Neale and Dupree followed in the negative, and several other members having spoken, the question was put to the vote and answered in the negative by a majority of four. Twenty-nine members were present.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVONPORT LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at the Athenaeum, Plymouth, on Friday, April 7, Thomas Wolferstan, Esq., in the chair. After the transaction of various items of business, the moot point for the evening was discussed:—"A tenant holds of trustees, who authorize the *cestui que trust* to give notice to quit; the *cestui que trust* does so in his own name and without purporting to be agent for the trustees. Is such a notice good?" Messrs. W. Oliver and C. Matthews spoke for the affirmative, and Messrs. M. Harrison and A. Chubb for the negative. After some remarks from Mr. E. F. Fox and a reply from Mr. Oliver, the chairman gave an able summing up, and finally the question was decided in the negative by the unanimous vote of the meeting.

Legal News.

The coronership for the Skipton district of Yorkshire has become vacant by the death of Mr. Thomas Brown, of Skipton, who was admitted a solicitor in 1822, and had been coroner for fifty years.

In sentencing to penal servitude a prisoner who had been five years in a reformatory, Mr. Baron Dowse said on Tuesday that the worst criminals who had come before him of late years were persons who had been educated in these institutions.

A question was raised in the House of Commons last week as to whether a petition could be received purporting to come from the inhabitants of Boulogne. On the 7th inst., the Speaker stated that he had searched for precedents in the matter, and had found one only, which he read to the House. It was as follows:—"17th of February, 1831.—Lord John Russell presented a petition from the inhabitants of Crete complaining of their sufferings under the Turkish Government in that island. Mr. Speaker said that a very important question was suggested to the consideration of the House, viz., whether petitions from persons who owed neither allegiance to, nor could claim the protection of, this country could be received. The object of the petitioners was to obtain the interference of the Crown of Great Britain to protect them from the miseries under which they were at the present moment labouring. Was this a petition at all? And, if so, was it not a petition to the Crown of Great Britain solely? The petition did not appear to contain any matter which brought it within the jurisdiction of the House of Commons. It commenced 'Honourable Sirs,' and stated that on 'the renowned English people, the lovers of liberty, the patrons and protectors of the injured, the Cretans place their last hope of salvation, looking up to them for the advocacy of the cause of Crete.' It was clear that the petition could not be received by the House of Commons. It was an address to the English nation. Petition withdrawn. (Decision of Mr. Speaker Manners Sutton.)" The Speaker added that this petition was not received mainly upon the ground that the petition related to a matter not within the jurisdiction of the House of Commons, while the petition from Boulogne offered to the House referred to a matter

quite within the jurisdiction of the House. The petitioners pray that the consulate in that town should remain a consulate, and should not become, as proposed, a vice-consulate. He submitted to the House that, if the House thought fit to receive, as an act of grace, a petition from inhabitants of the town of Boulogne (some of whom appeared to be British subjects) upon such a matter, it might be received upon the ground that the subject referred to a matter within the jurisdiction of the House. The matter was ultimately referred to a select committee.

The course of our Government and our courts, says the *Albany Law Journal*, in regard to the trial of extradited criminals is calculated to discourage future improvements in the law of extradition, if not to compel other Governments to abandon treaties already in existence between them and us. The Government of Great Britain refuses, it is said, to surrender Winslow until our Government shall give some guaranty that he will be prosecuted only for the offence for which extradition is procured. This is, as we have frequently maintained, entirely just and reasonable; nevertheless, our Department of State, with characteristic blindness to the new and better views of international intercourse, refuses, bluntly, to comply with this condition of Great Britain. Now, the treaty of 1842, which contains the provisions relating to extradition between Great Britain and this country, has no limitation of the kind indicated. But, if there is any common law of nations, we should suppose that it would supply the deficiency. If our Government refuses to comply with the condition that an extradited person shall be tried only for the offence for which extradition is procured, we do not believe that we shall long be able to maintain extradition treaties with other Governments at all. In this connection it may be well to notice that Judge Benedict has decided that Lawrence, whose extradition was procured from England, may be tried for any offence whatever, irrespective of the manner in which he was brought into the jurisdiction of the courts. We repeat that, if such counsels are to prevail in the Department of the State, and such opinions in the courts, we shall soon find that no Government will care to keep up extradition relations with us.

The *Academy* thus describes the changes in the inscription on the Great Seal since the Revolution:—"After the Revolution the name of Scotland was for some time omitted from the Great Seal altogether. The way in which this happened was as follows:—After William and Mary had been declared to be King and Queen of England by the English Convention, and before the meeting of the Scotch Estates, the seal was made, and, in accordance with the existing facts, the inscription on it was 'Guilielmus III. et Maria II. Dei Gra. Ang. Fra. et Hib. Rex et Regina, Fidei Defensores, &c.' Soon afterwards William and Mary were called to the throne of Scotland, but no new seal was made until the Queen's death, when the inscription was altered to 'Guilielmus III. D. Gra. Mag. Bri. Fra. et Hib. Rex, Fidei Defensor, &c.' William wrote himself 'King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland,' and so, *mutatis mutandis*, did Anne, although her seal was the same as her predecessor's, until the legislative union with Scotland in 1707, after which she adopted the new style in written documents. No further alteration was introduced until the union with Ireland in 1801, when the title now in use was promulgated by a Royal proclamation issued in accordance with the provisions of the Act of Union. The change then made in the English title was threefold. First, 'France' was omitted. Ever since 1558, when, by the loss of Calais, England was deprived of the last remnant of her dominion in France, the retention of the title of King of France by the Sovereigns of this country had been a meaningless pretension which was worse than useless on account of the embarrassment which it caused in negotiations with France. It was, therefore, silently got rid of. Secondly, and principally, 'the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland' was substituted for 'Great Britain and Ireland.' And, lastly, that curious little '&c.' (which had often been translated into the still more curious expression 'and so forth,' as for instance, 'George the Third, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, and so forth') was dropped. The Latin title was declared to be 'Georgius Tertius, Dei Gratia, Britanniarum Rex, Fidei Defensor,' which style has ever since continued to be used on the Great Seal and the coinage. Whether a new Great Seal will now have to be made remains to be seen."

WILLIAM PINKNEY.

(See ante, p. 440.)

In elocution Pinkney seems to have been theatrical, pretentious, and affected, full of strong contrasts. His voice was not good, but rather husky, feeble, and harsh, his manner vehement and impetuous, almost boisterous, his gestures violent, his whole body in continual motion. He had a trick of alternately elevating and depressing his voice that became painful. He succeeded in spite of these defects in impressing his contemporaries with his oratorical powers, thus giving another proof of the correctness of Demosthenes' definition. Of his impatience and rage for the fray Mr. Ticknor gives us an amusing picture: "I was in court all this morning. The session was opened by Judge Story and the Chief Justice, who read elaborate opinions. During this time Mr. Pinkney was very restless, frequently moved his seat, and when sitting showed, by the convulsive twitches of his face, how anxious he was to come to the conflict. At last the judges ceased to read, and he sprang into the arena like a lion who had been loosed by his keepers on the gladiator who awaited him."

Pinkney's arrogance, jealousy, and want of magnanimity, were glaring defects in his character. He not only would brook no rival near the throne, but always essayed to bowstring him out of hand. Two of his encounters with opposing counsel—one with Emmett and one with Wirt—are quite famous. All contemporary accounts agree that he behaved most indecently in both. In regard to the former, Ticknor, who heard it—it was in *The Neivide case*—speaks of the "somewhat coarse contempt" with which he treated his grand antagonist, and of the "presumption and affection" of his address. The noble Irishman's response to these ungenerous attacks is historic. "The gentleman," said he, "yesterday announced to the court his purpose to show that I was mistaken in every statement of facts, and every conclusion of law which I had laid before it. Of his success to-day the court alone have a right to judge; but I must be permitted to say, that in my estimation, the manner of announcing his threat of yesterday, and of attempting to fulfil it to-day, was not very courteous to a stranger, an equal, and one who is so truly inclined to honour his talents and learning. It is a manner which I am persuaded he did not learn in the polite circles of Europe, to which he referred, and which I sincerely wish he had forgotten there, wherever he may have learned it." Pinkney's "cold and inefficient explanation," Ticknor says, "impelled me to feel almost sorry that I had been obliged so much to admire his high talents and success." So discourteous was he towards Wirt, that a duel was with some difficulty averted, and his friend and admirer, Story, was constrained to write:—"I am quite persuaded, without having heard a word of the facts, that our friend Mr. Pinkney is wrong in the recent disagreement with Mr. Wirt. The latter is a most worthy, good-humoured, spirited gentleman, of eminent talents and fine accomplishments. Mr. Pinkney should not undervalue him, nor seek to obtain a temporary glory by robbing him of a single laurel. This world is wide enough for all the learning and genius, public virtue and ambition, of all the wise and good, and it is a great mistake for a great man to indulge in an arrogant pride or a morbid jealousy in respect to his competitors or rivals. I have the highest opinion of Mr. Pinkney, who is truly *principes intr principes*. We must talk with him on this subject, and make him feel he has much to lose, and nothing to gain, by the course he sometimes pursues." Nor do we discover, from the testimony of his contemporaries, that he was much more agreeable or courteous out of court, or that he displayed many of the graces of the accomplished scholar and gentleman. Story confesses that he seemed distant, reserved, and haughty, and that when he conversed with him he found him sluggish. "His first appearance is not prepossessing," he continues. "He has the air of a man of fashion, of *hauteur*, of superiority, and something, I hardly know what to call it, of abrupt and crusty precision. On acquaintance, this wears away, and you find him a very pleasant, interesting gentleman, full of anecdote and general remarks." That Pinkney did not greatly command the love of his fellow-men is evident from Story's remarks, in a letter to his wife, on the indifference with which the intelligence of his sudden and fatal illness was received—the "calamity made but a momentary impression," he says, "and the next

day it was as little thought of, except in the circle of particular friends, as if it were an event of a century ago."

In person Pinkney was a striking and somewhat amusing figure. He had a tendency to corpulence, which greatly annoyed him, and which he endeavoured to restrain by wearing corsets. Possibly he had a professional reason for this habit—having so many cases to argue about vessels, he may have thought it appropriate to go to court in *slays*. If Mrs. Gore (wife of one of the commissioners on the Jay treaty) is to be credited, he also used cosmetics to soften and smooth the rugosities of his skin! This may be scandal; we know the ladies are fond of inventing such stories about one another. He always dressed in a style which would have been pronounced foppish in a much younger man. His appearance is thus described by Story:—"The personal appearance of Mr. P. was as polished as if he had been taken right from the drawer; his coat of the finest blue was nicely brushed; his boots shone with the highest polish; his waistcoat of perfect whiteness glittered with gold buttons; he played in his hand with a light cane; in short, he seemed perfectly satisfied with himself, and walked through the court-house with an air of ease and *abandon*, arising from perfect self-confidence." Ticknor says, after describing his dandyism, "You must imagine such a man standing before the gravest tribunal in the land, and engaged in causes of the deepest moment; but still apparently thinking how he can declaim like a practised rhetorician in the London Cockpit, which he used to frequent." His portrait in the "National Portrait Gallery," displaying a countenance by no means intellectual, accords with these accounts of his costume, and represents several curls on his forehead which could scarcely have been the work of blind chance. He was a great favourite among the ladies, who always crowded the court-room to hear him. On his first return from Europe there was intense curiosity to hear him, and a numerous mixed assembly gathered in the supreme court-room to listen to his first argument. The cause was an unfortunate one for the display of rhetoric or sentiment—a case of insurance upon a cargo of asses. Out of consideration for the sensibilities of his audience, Mr. Pinkney never once expressed the name of those poor animals, but had recourse to much inconvenient and mysterious periphrases. Story says:—"He attempted to introduce a little finery to please the ladies; though in fact the case did not well admit of it. He foamed at the mouth and tore things all to tatters. The argument was very good, as an argument; but he evidently overdid it. But then what could he do? There was the audience; they had come with expectation of hearing a specimen of fine speaking—be the subject what it might—and they must be gratified. He did not, on the whole, sustain himself on that occasion." His comparative failure caused him great mortification, and he redeemed his reputation when he had a more fortunate subject of discourse.

His affectation kept pace with his vanity. Although his arguments are always laboured, and he would never speak without the most exhaustive preparation, yet he desired to have it thought that all was *ex tempore*. If there was a great party or public meeting near, he would be sure to attend it, and then go home and study all night in his cause for the next morning. In this he imitated Loughborough. The passages which he thus prepared sometimes twenty minutes or half an hour in length, were so nicely fitted in his argument that the joints could not be discovered, and it was these passages which produced the greatest effect, especially upon the general audience. He would also quote the language of an authority, apparently from early memory of it, saying he was not quite certain of the exact language, when he had probably studied it out for the very occasion. By this course he sometimes seduced the opposite counsel into disputing his accuracy, and then produced a great effect by sending for the book and reading the passage, first telling the court the page and the very part of the page. Of course these tricks were found out after a while, but the detection did him no harm, as the affectation of learning and memory were superfluous where so much was genuine.

Pinkney's vanity was at length the cause of his death. He was arguing a cause before the Supreme Court, when Story, perceiving he could hardly proceed on account of

hoarseness, sent the clerk to him with a message that he had better cease speaking—that the court would adjourn for him. To this he replied: "Tell Judge Story that I am much obliged to him for the kind suggestion, but that I must go on; I have a reputation to maintain; I can sacrifice that." He proceeded, but the fatigue and exhaustion sent him to his bed, from which he never rose.

It is not an agreeable task to depict a character in which so much of the mean and petty mingled with the sublime. Although several biographies of Pinkney have been written, yet they are utterly lacking in all biographies should contain:—no domestic traits, no anecdotes, no examples of wit or good humour. Perhaps the fault was in the subject. At all events we find little but dry details and fragments from speeches which give no adequate or favourable idea of the man's powers. We are told, it is true, that Pinkney was a good shot and fond of hunting, expert at billiards, and whist, fond of nature, that he sketched capably for his children, was much given to novel-reading, hospitable, profuse of money, and a great student of prosody and dictionaries. Our chief sources of information are the letter-writers, but fortunately, in this instance, they are such men that their representations are entitled to implicit belief. The reader would have more patience with this great man's foibles if they had been accompanied, as in Erskine, by an unflinching amiability and magnanimity. And yet we must bow to his greatness, so shining as to make us almost forget his weaknesses. One of his greatest and most judicious admirers said, on returning from his funeral: "It is impossible to contemplate the death of such a man without the most painful emotions. His genius and eloquence were so lofty, I might almost say, so unrivalled, his learning so extensive, his ambition so elevated, his political and constitutional principles so truly just and pure, his weight in the public councils so decisive, his character at the bar so peerless and commanding, that there seems now left a dismal and perplexing vacancy. His foibles and faults were so trifling or excusable, in comparison with his greatness, that they are at once forgotten and forgiven with his deposit in the grave. His great talents are now universally acknowledged. As Mason has beautifully said, in his *Elegy on Lady Coventry*,

"This envy owns, since now those charms are fled."

—*Albany Law Journal*.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

April 6.—SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Their lordships resumed the committee on this Bill.

In clause 16, there is this sub-section:—"For altering the conditions of eligibility to any emolument or office, other than the headship, held in the college, and the mode of election thereto, the length and conditions of tenure thereof, and the powers appertaining thereto, and for providing a pension for a holder thereof, or any of these matters."—The Earl of CAMPERDOWN moved to omit the words "and the powers appertaining thereto."—The motion was agreed to, and the words were struck out of the clause.—The Earl of ARLIE proposed the following proviso to be added to the clause:—"Provided that it shall not be lawful for the commissioners to annex to the headship of a college or to a fellowship or other emolument, the holder of which is not now required to subscribe any religious test, any office which is restricted to persons in holy orders, or the holder of which is required to subscribe any article or formula of faith, or to make any declaration or take any oath respecting his religious belief or profession, or to conform to any religious observance, or to attend or abstain from attending any form of public worship, or to belong to any specified church, sect, or denomination."—The amendment was agreed to, and the proviso was ordered to stand part of the clause.—The Archbishop of CANTERBURY proposed as an amendment to give the commissioners power to make provision "for diminishing the expense of education in the college by assigning salaries to college tutors, lecturers, or otherwise."—The amendment was agreed to.—

The Earl of MORLEY moved an addition to the clause to the effect that the commissioners might also, on the application of any two or more colleges, make provision for their complete or partial union, such application to be made by at least two-thirds of the governing bodies of the said colleges.—The addition was agreed to, and the clause was agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 19 were agreed to.

On clause 20 (communication of proposed statutes for university, &c., to Hebdomadal Council), the Archbishop of CANTERBURY moved the insertion of "or the visitor" after "Hebdomadal Council."—The amendment was agreed to, and the clause was agreed to.

Clauses 21 to 23 were agreed to.

On clause 24, the Duke of SOMERSET moved to amend the clause by inserting words authorizing the commissioners to take evidence upon matters relating to the constitution of the university and colleges, and the proper mode of applying the revenues in dealing with the emoluments thereof, and requiring them to publish the same from time to time.—On a division the amendment was rejected by 39 to 24.

The clause was agreed to.

Clauses 25 to 43 were agreed to.

Lord CARLINGFORD moved the insertion of the following clause:—"On and after the 15th day of Michaelmas Term, 1876, the congregation of the University of Oxford shall be composed of the following persons only, the said persons being members of Convocation:—The Chancellor, the High Steward, the heads of colleges and halls, the proctors, the members of the Hebdomadal Council, the officers named in the schedule to this Act annexed, the professors, lecturers, and readers of the university, the public examiners, resident fellows of colleges, all persons who shall be certified by the head of any college or hall to be engaged in the tuition, discipline, or administration of such college or hall."—The clause was negatived without a division.

Lord COLCHESTER moved a new clause regulating the constitution of Convocation, but the clause was withdrawn.

The remaining clauses were agreed to, and the chairman was ordered to report the Bill.

ROYAL TITLES.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

April 6.—MERCHANT SHIPPING.

The consideration of this Bill in committee was resumed.

On clause 6, which deals with the constitution of the court of survey for appeals, Mr. E. SMITH moved an amendment providing that one assessor should be appointed by the Board of Trade, either generally or in each case, out of a list of persons periodically nominated by a local body of shipowners, and that the second assessor should be selected out of the list by the parties nominating the same.—The amendment was negatived.

Clauses 7 and 8 were agreed to.

On clause 9, which relates to liability in cases of detention, Mr. RATHBONE moved an amendment providing that when a ship was provisionally detained without being in an unsafe condition at the time of such detention the owner should be compensated.—The amendment was agreed to, and the clause was agreed to.

On clause 10 ("Power to require from complainant security for costs"), Sir C. ADDERLEY moved the addition of the words "being not less than three" after the words "one-fourth."—The amendment was agreed to.—Mr. PLIMMELL moved the omission of the words "and is not in the opinion of the Board or officer frivolous or vexatious such security shall not be required."—The amendment was withdrawn, and the clause as amended was agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 13, as amended, were also agreed to.

On clause 14, which deals with grain cargoes, Mr. PLIMMELL moved to insert words extending the operation of the clause to foreign ships trading with British ports.—The amendment was withdrawn, and the chairman was ordered to report progress.

April 7.—POOR LAW AMENDMENT.

The House went into committee on this Bill, and clauses 1 to 11 were agreed to.—Progress was then reported.

CATTLE DISEASES (IRELAND).

The House went into committee on this Bill, but progress was immediately reported.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3).

Mr. SALT introduced a Bill to confirm certain provisional orders of the Local Government Board relating to the borough of Blackburn and other districts.

TRIAL BY JURY (IRELAND).

Sir M. HICKS-BEACH introduced a Bill to amend the procedure connected with trial by jury in Ireland.

JURORS' QUALIFICATION (IRELAND).

Sir M. HICKS-BEACH introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to the qualification of jurors in Ireland.

April 10.—SOLICITOR TO THE TREASURY.

Mr. W. H. SMITH introduced a Bill to incorporate the Solicitor to the Treasury, and to make further provision respecting the grant to him of the administration of the estates of deceased persons.

HIGHWAYS.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to the management of highways.

Courts.

COUNTY COURTS.

LEEDS.

(Before JOHN SCOTT, Esq., Deputy Judge.)

Rayner v. Mitchell.

Liability of master for negligent act of servant—Implied assent of master to the relation of master and servant at the time of the injury.

HIS HONOUR said he had to deliver judgment in this case. The judgment had been prepared by the learned judge of the court (Serjeant Tindal Atkinson), who was, owing to a severe domestic affliction, unable to attend:—This is an issue remitted by the Court of Exchequer, to be tried before me, in which the plaintiff, Joseph Rayner, a cab proprietor at Headingley, seeks to recover from the defendant, Joseph Mitchell, a brewer at Burmantofts, damages caused by the negligent driving of the defendant's servant on the 5th of March, 1875, by which the plaintiff's cab was broken and otherwise injured. At the trial two defences were set up by the defendant's counsel, Mr. West:—(1) That there was contributory negligence at the time of the accident on the part of the plaintiff's servant; (2) That at that time the defendant's servant was using the defendant's horse and cart for a purpose of his own, and was not in the defendant's employment. The following are the facts which I find proved in this case:—On the 5th of March of last year, the plaintiff's driver, Alfred Wadsworth, was, in the course of his employment, going in the direction of Roundhay. He was on his near or right side, when, observing the defendant's horse and cart coming rapidly towards him on the wrong side of the road, he called out so as to give warning, and drew up on the footpath. While in this position the horse and cart of the defendant came in contact with the plaintiff's cab, and did the injury complained of. The course of the employment of the defendant's driver was that he took out beer to private customers and called on his return to the defendant's brewery for empty casks wherever they would be likely to be collected, for which he received 1d. each from the defendant. On this particular day, the 5th of March, the defendant's driver had, without permission, taken the defendant's horse and cart out of his master's stables for a purpose of his own, namely, to deliver a child's coffin at a relative's house at Roundhay, and, having accomplished his purpose, was returning to Leeds. Before the accident happened he had called at a public-house which the defendant supplied with beer to inquire for empty barrels, and having obtained one or two he continued his journey to his master's brewery. Shortly after

this he swerved from his own side of the road, and, proceeding at a rapid pace, he drove on to the plaintiff's cab, and did the damage complained of. Upon these facts, I find, as to the first point raised for the defendant, that there was no contributory negligence on the part of the plaintiff's servant leading to the accident. With respect to the second point—namely, that the defendant's servant having for a purpose of his own, and without his master's permission, taken the horse and cart out of the latter's possession, he could not be said for the purposes of this action to be the defendant's servant, so as to fix the master for the consequences of his negligent conduct—a somewhat difficult question arises. In cases in which the master has been absolved from liability for damage caused by the wrongful act done by the servant while driving with the master's horse and vehicle, the servant was at the time using them without the knowledge or permission of his master, and for the servant's own purpose, as in *Mitchell v. Crasweller*, 1 W. R. 153, 13 C. B. 257. The present case differs in its facts in this, that the defendant's carter having, without the orders of his master, taken out the horse and cart to accomplish an object of his own, and, having completed it, but before the return journey is finished, enters upon his ordinary duties by collecting casks for his employer, who receives them at the end of the journey. The nearest case to the present is that of *Patten v. Rea*, 5 W. R. 689, 2 C. B. N. S. 606. There the servant had taken out a horse and gig used by his master for his business, partly for his master's purposes, and also for private business of his own, and, while so engaged, did the damage complained of. There it was held that it clearly is not necessary in cases of this sort that there should be an express request on the part of the master for the use by the servant of the horse and gig; the jury may in all such cases imply a request or assent from the general nature of the servant's duty and employment. In the present case I hold that no express request was necessary for the defendant's servant to collect the empty barrels, and that even if it were, the defendant had assented to the servant's act in collecting them, and had thereby rendered an express request unnecessary. The injury done by the servant to the plaintiff's cab was done, in my view of the facts, while he was engaged in his master's employment; and there must, therefore, be judgment for the plaintiff for £12 13s. with costs, with leave to appeal.

E. Tindal Atkinson, for plaintiff.
West, for defendant.

Court Papers.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

NOTICE.

The Master of the Rolls and the Vice-Chancellors have given directions that motions for judgment in actions shall not be brought on as ordinary motions, but shall be set down in the cause-book.

They can be marked short on production of the usual certificate of counsel, and will then be placed in the paper on the first short-cause day after the day for which notice is given. If not marked short, they will come into the general paper in their regular turn.

It will be advisable that the notices of motion for judgment should, if it is intended to mark them short, contain a statement to that effect, and also a statement that no further notice will be given of their having been so marked. Such statement will dispense with the necessity for giving defendants further notice that motions for judgment have been marked short.

Where a defendant makes his defence, and the plaintiff moves under ord. 40, r. 11, for such order as he is entitled to on the admissions of the defendant, the action need not be set down, but if, on the motion being made, it appears that there must be a discussion or argument, it may be ordered to go into the general paper, subject to any order for its being advanced.

R. H. LEACH, Senior Registrar.

Chancery Registrars' Office, April 11.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1876.

COURT OF APPEAL.

Lincoln's-inn and Westminster.

Tuesday Apl. 25	{ App. motns. ex pte, Apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. and other apps.	Wednesday 17	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 26	{ Appeals.	Thursday .. 18	{ Bkt. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 27	{ Bkcy. apps. and other apps.	Friday 19	{ Appeals.
Friday 28	{ Appeals.	Saturday y .. 20	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 29	{ Appeals.	Monday 21	{ Appeals.
Monday May 1	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 22	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday ... 2	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 24	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 3	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 25	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thrsday 4	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday 26	{ Appeals.
Friday 5	{ Appeals.	Sa. urday ... 27	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 6	{ Appeals.	Monday 28	{ Appeals.
Monday 7	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 29	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 8	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 31	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 10	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 32	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 11	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 33	{ Appeals.
Friday 12	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 34	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 13	{ Appeals.	Monday 35	{ Appeals.
Monday 14	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 36	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 15	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 38	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 16	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 39	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 17	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 40	{ Appeals.
Friday 18	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 41	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 19	{ Appeals.	Monday 42	{ Appeals.
Monday 20	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 43	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 21	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 44	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 22	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 45	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 23	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 46	{ Appeals.
Friday 24	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 47	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 25	{ Appeals.	Monday 48	{ Appeals.
Monday 26	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 49	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 27	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 50	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 28	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 51	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 29	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 52	{ Appeals.
Friday 30	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 53	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 31	{ Appeals.	Monday 54	{ Appeals.
Monday 32	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 55	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 33	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 56	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 34	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 57	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 35	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 58	{ Appeals.
Friday 36	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 59	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 37	{ Appeals.	Monday 60	{ Appeals.
Monday 38	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 61	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 39	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 62	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 40	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 63	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 41	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 64	{ Appeals.
Friday 42	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 65	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 43	{ Appeals.	Monday 66	{ Appeals.
Monday 44	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 67	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 45	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 68	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 46	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 69	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 47	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 70	{ Appeals.
Friday 48	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 71	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 49	{ Appeals.	Monday 72	{ Appeals.
Monday 50	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 73	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 51	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 74	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 52	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 75	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 53	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 76	{ Appeals.
Friday 54	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 77	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 55	{ Appeals.	Monday 78	{ Appeals.
Monday 56	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 79	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 57	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 80	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 54	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 81	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 55	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 82	{ Appeals.
Friday 56	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 83	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 57	{ Appeals.	Monday 84	{ Appeals.
Monday 58	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 85	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 59	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 86	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 56	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 87	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 57	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 88	{ Appeals.
Friday 58	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 89	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 59	{ Appeals.	Monday 90	{ Appeals.
Monday 60	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 91	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 61	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 92	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 62	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 93	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 63	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 94	{ Appeals.
Friday 64	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 95	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 65	{ Appeals.	Monday 96	{ Appeals.
Monday 66	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 97	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 67	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 98	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 64	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 99	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 65	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 100	{ Appeals.
Friday 66	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 101	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 67	{ Appeals.	Monday 102	{ Appeals.
Monday 68	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 103	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 69	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 104	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 66	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 105	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 67	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 106	{ Appeals.
Friday 68	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 107	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 69	{ Appeals.	Monday 108	{ Appeals.
Monday 70	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 109	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 71	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 110	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 68	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 111	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 69	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 112	{ Appeals.
Friday 70	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 113	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 71	{ Appeals.	Monday 114	{ Appeals.
Monday 72	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 115	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 73	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 116	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 70	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 117	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 71	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 118	{ Appeals.
Friday 72	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 119	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 73	{ Appeals.	Monday 120	{ Appeals.
Monday 74	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 121	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 75	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 122	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 72	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 123	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 73	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 124	{ Appeals.
Friday 74	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 125	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 75	{ Appeals.	Monday 126	{ Appeals.
Monday 76	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 127	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 77	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 128	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 74	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 129	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 75	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 130	{ Appeals.
Friday 76	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 131	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 77	{ Appeals.	Monday 132	{ Appeals.
Monday 78	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 133	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 79	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 134	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 76	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 135	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 77	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 136	{ Appeals.
Friday 78	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 137	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 79	{ Appeals.	Monday 138	{ Appeals.
Monday 80	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 139	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 81	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 140	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 78	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 141	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 79	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 142	{ Appeals.
Friday 80	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 143	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 81	{ Appeals.	Monday 144	{ Appeals.
Monday 82	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 145	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 83	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 146	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 80	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 147	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 81	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 148	{ Appeals.
Friday 82	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 149	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 83	{ Appeals.	Monday 150	{ Appeals.
Monday 84	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 151	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 85	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 152	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 82	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 153	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 83	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 154	{ Appeals.
Friday 84	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 155	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 85	{ Appeals.	Monday 156	{ Appeals.
Monday 86	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 157	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 87	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 158	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 84	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 159	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 85	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 160	{ Appeals.
Friday 86	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 161	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 87	{ Appeals.	Monday 162	{ Appeals.
Monday 88	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 163	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 89	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 164	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 86	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 165	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 87	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 166	{ Appeals.
Friday 88	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 167	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 89	{ Appeals.	Monday 168	{ Appeals.
Monday 90	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 169	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 91	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 170	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 88	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 171	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 89	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 172	{ Appeals.
Friday 90	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 173	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 91	{ Appeals.	Monday 174	{ Appeals.
Monday 92	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 175	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 93	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 176	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 90	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 177	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 91	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 178	{ Appeals.
Friday 92	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 179	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 93	{ Appeals.	Monday 180	{ Appeals.
Monday 94	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 181	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 95	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 182	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 92	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 183	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 93	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 184	{ Appeals.
Friday 94	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 185	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 95	{ Appeals.	Monday 186	{ Appeals.
Monday 96	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 187	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 97	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 188	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 94	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 189	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 95	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 190	{ Appeals.
Friday 96	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 191	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 97	{ Appeals.	Monday 192	{ Appeals.
Monday 98	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 193	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 99	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 194	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 96	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 195	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 97	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 196	{ Appeals.
Friday 98	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 197	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 99	{ Appeals.	Monday 198	{ Appeals.
Monday 100	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 199	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 101	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 200	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 98	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 201	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 99	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 202	{ Appeals.
Friday 100	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 203	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 101	{ Appeals.	Monday 204	{ Appeals.
Monday 102	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 205	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 103	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 206	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 100	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 207	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 101	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 208	{ Appeals.
Friday 102	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 209	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 103	{ Appeals.	Monday 210	{ Appeals.
Monday 104	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 211	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 105	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 212	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 102	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 213	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 103	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 214	{ Appeals.
Friday 104	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 215	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 105	{ Appeals.	Monday 216	{ Appeals.
Monday 106	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 217	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 107	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 218	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 104	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 219	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 105	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 220	{ Appeals.
Friday 106	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 221	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 107	{ Appeals.	Monday 222	{ Appeals.
Monday 108	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 223	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 109	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 224	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 106	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 225	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 107	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 226	{ Appeals.
Friday 108	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 227	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 109	{ Appeals.	Monday 228	{ Appeals.
Monday 110	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 229	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 111	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 230	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 108	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 231	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 109	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 232	{ Appeals.
Friday 110	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 233	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 111	{ Appeals.	Monday 234	{ Appeals.
Monday 112	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 235	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 113	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 236	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 110	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 237	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 111	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 238	{ Appeals.
Friday 112	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 239	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 113	{ Appeals.	Monday 240	{ Appeals.
Monday 114	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 241	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 115	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 242	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 112	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 243	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 113	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 244	{ Appeals.
Friday 114	{ Appeals.	Saturday .. 245	{ Appeals.
Saturday ... 115	{ Appeals.	Monday 246	{ Appeals.
Monday 116	{ Appeals.	Tuesday 247	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Tuesday 117	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.	Wednesday 248	{ App. motns. ex pte, apps. from orders made on interlocutory motns. & other apps.
Wednesday 114	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Thursday .. 249	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.
Thursday .. 115	{ Bkcy. apps. & other apps.	Friday .. 250	{ Appeals.
Friday			

Saturday ..27 {Adj. sums. & gen.
pa.
Monday29 } General paper.
Tuesday30 }
Wednesday..31 }
Thursday June 1. } Motns. & gen. pa.
Friday 2 } Sht. cause, peins.
& gen. pa.

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

V. C. Sir JAMES BACON.

Lincoln's-inn.

Tuesday Apl. 25 } Motns. adj. sums
& gen. pa.
Wednesday ..26 } General paper.
Thursday27 }
Friday28 }
Saturday29 } Petns. sht. caus.
& gen. pa.
Monday May 1. } In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday 2 } General paper.
Wednesday 3 }
Thursday 4 } Mts. adj. sums. &
& gen. pa.
Friday 5 } General paper.
Saturday 6 } Petns. sht. caus. &
& gen. pa.
Monday 8 } In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday 9 } General paper.
Wednesday 10 }
Thursday 11 } Motns. adj. sums
& gen. pa.
Friday 12 } General paper.
Saturday 13 } Petns. sht. caus. &
& gen. pa.
Monday 15 } In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday 16 } General paper.
Wednesday 17 }
Thursday 18 } Motns. adj. sums
& gen. pa.
Friday 19 } General paper.
Saturday 20 } Petns. sht. caus.
& gen. pa.
Monday 22 } In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday 23 } General paper.
Wednesday 24 }
Thursday 25 } Motns. adj. sums
& gen. pa.
Friday 26 } General paper.
Saturday 27 } Petns. sht. caus.
& gen. pa.
Monday 29 } In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday 30 } General paper.
Wednesday 31 }
Thursday June 1 } Motns. adj. sums
& gen. pa.

[[Further considerations will be taken as part of the general paper in priority to original causes which have not already appeared in the paper.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

April 13, 1876.

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	141
Stock Caledonian	100	117½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	99
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	48
Stock Great Northern	100	133
Stock Do., A Stock	100	134
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original	100	107½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	133½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	117½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	23
Stock London and North-Western	100	148½
Stock London and South-Western	100	125
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	60½
Stock Metropolitan	100	59½
Stock Do., District	100	45½
Stock Midland	100	132½
Stock North British	100	99½
Stock North Eastern	100	157
Stock North London	100	129
Stock North Staffordshire	100	68
Stock North Devon	100	69
Stock South-Eastern	100	136

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

Friday 2 { Petns. sht. caus.
& gen. pa.
Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

V. C. Sir CHARLES HALL.

Lincoln's-inn.

Tuesday Apl. 25 } Mts. & gen. pa.
Wednesday ..26 } General paper.
Thursday27 }
Friday28 } Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday 29 } Short caus. adj.
& gen. pa.
Monday May 1 }
Tuesday 2 } General paper.
Wednesday 3 }
Thursday 4 } Mts. & gen. pa.
Friday 5 } Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday 6 } Sht. caus. adj.
& gen. pa.
Monday 8 }
Tuesday 9 } General paper.
Wednesday 10 }
Thursday 11 } Motns. & gen. pa.
Friday 12 } Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday 13 } Sht. caus. adj.
& gen. pa.
Monday 15 }
Tuesday 16 } General paper.
Wednesday 17 }
Thursday 18 } Motns. & gen. pa.
Friday 19 } Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday 20 } Sht. caus. adj.
& gen. pa.
Monday 22 }
Tuesday 23 } General paper.
Wednesday 24 }
Thursday 25 } Motns. & gen. pa.
Friday 26 } Sht. caus. adj.
& gen. pa.
Saturday 27 } Sums. & gen. pa.
Monday 29 }
Tuesday 30 } General paper.
Wednesday 31 }
Thursday June 1 } Motns. & gen. pa.
Friday 2 } adj. sums. & gen. pa.

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 94½
Ditto for Account, May 4, 94½
Do 2 per Cent. Reduced, 92½
New 3 per Cent., 92½
Do 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do 5 per Cent., Jan. '78
Annuities, Jan. '80 —
Annuities, April, '88, 97
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
Ex Billa, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 4 pm.
Ditto, £500, Do, 2 pm.
Ditto, £100 & £200, 4 pm.
Bank of England Stock, — per
Ct. (last half-year), 253
Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80, 105½
Ditto for Account. —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 101½
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —
Ditto Exchanged Ppr., 4 per Cent. 85
2nd Ind. Ppr., 5 per Ct., Jan. '73
Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79, 88
Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent.
April, '64
Do, Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '78
Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
Ditto, ditto, under £1000

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The directors have made no change in the Bank rate this week. The foreign market has been in a complete state of panic, Egyptian and Peruvian securities being principally affected; but the fall has been general, and all stocks are lower than last week. Home railways have been steady, and no doubt would have improved had not the severe weather and the panic in the foreign market helped to depress them; the changes in price are about equal, and do not exceed 1½ per cent. in any shares. Consols close at 94½ to 94½ for money, and 94½ to 94½ for account.

BIRTHS AND MARRIAGES.

BIRTH.

POLLOCK—April 6, at 4, Chester-place, Regent's-park, the wife of Edward Pollock, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.

MARRIAGE.

LEWIS—CHAMBERS—April 7, at St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, William Arnold Lewis, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, only son of the late William David Lewis, Q.C., of Lincoln's-inn, to Fanny Jane Chambers, of Worcester-park, Surrey, daughter of the late William Chambers, of Addlestone, Surrey, and niece of Sir Thomas Chambers, Q.C., M.P.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, April 7, 1876.

Bateson, William Gandy, John Park Robinson, Christopher Morris, Alfred Bright, and Augustus Frederick Warr, Liverpool, Solicitors and Notaries. Dec 31
Maples, Frederick, John Marmaduke Tensdale, William Maples, and Marmaduke John Tensdale, 6, Frederick's place, Old Jewry, London, Solicitors. April 3

TUESDAY, April 11, 1876.

Norris, Anthony, Anthony John Norris, and Henry Joseph Norris, 2, Bedford row, Middlesex, Attorneys and Solicitors. April 6

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, April 7, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Bath Colliery Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 31, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on April 28
Merediths and Co, New square, Lincoln's inn, agents for David Denbigh, solicitor for the petitioner.

British Guardian Life Assurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 31, directed to be heard before the M.R. on April 29. Beall, Queen's buildings, Queen Victoria st, solicitor for the petitioner.

Maria Anna and Steinbank Coal and Coke Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 29, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Bewley, Brown's buildings, Exchange, Liverpool. Monday, May 8, at 12, is

appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims. Mountain Chief Mining Company of Utah, Limited.—V.C. Malins has, by an order dated Feb 18, appointed David Parry, Philipot lane, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before June 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Saturday, July 1, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Percy and Kelly Nickel, Cobalt, and Chromo Iron Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 31, directed to be heard before the M.R. on April 29. Edwards and Son, Cloak lane, solicitors for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, April 11, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Central Swedish Iron and Steel Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 8, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on April 28. Merrick and Co, Dove court, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioner.

Financial and Investors' Protection Association, Limited.—Petition for

winding up, presented April 1, directed to be heard before the V.C. Bacon on April 29. Maynew, Walbrook, solicitor for the petitioner. Malvern Hotel Company, Limited.—The M.R. has, by an order dated March 24, appointed William Joseph White, King at, Cheapside, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before May 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Tuesday, May 30, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims. Manchester Provident Assurance Society, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated March 24, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Clarke and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Hartcup and Sons, Buncay, solicitors for the petitioner. Mid Wales Hotel Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented April 7, directed to be heard before the M.R. on April 29. Foss, Abersuch lane, solicitor for the petitioner. Printing and Numerical Registering Company, Limited.—The M.R. has, by an order dated Feb 18, appointed George Augustus Cape, Old Jewry, to be official liquidator. Trimsaran Coal, Iron, and Steel Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated April 1, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Carr and Co, Basinghall st, solicitors for the petitioners.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

Crover and Wheal Abraham United Mines Company, Limited.—Petition that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued, presented April 6, directed to be heard before the Vice-Warden, at the Law Institution, Chancery lane, on Tuesday, April 25, at 3. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the registrar's office, Truro, on or before April 22, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioners, their solicitor, or his agent. Snell, George at, Mansion House, solicitor for the liquidators; Chilcott, Truro, agent.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

Friday, April 7, 1876.
Faintax, March 31, 1876.
Tuesday, April 11, 1876.
Victoria Friendly Society, Launceston, Cornwall. April 6

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

Friday, March 31, 1876.

Alison, Charles, Minister at Toheran. May 8. Ongley v Hill, V.C. Malins. [Next of Kin].
Brewer, James Williams, Mildmay rd, Islington, Kent. May 1. Geach v Brewer, V.C. Hall. Leary and Co, Albion chambers, Moorgate at
Briggs, John, Clayton, Sussex, General H.M.'s Army. May 6.
Nelson v DeMorgan, V.C. Hall. Waddilove and Nutt, Godliman st, Doctors' commons
Brome, John, Brighton, Sussex, Esq. April 28. Aids v Bashford, M.R. Hutchins, Bexley lane
Potter, Ephraim Charles, West Brockley, Kent, Brick Maker. April 25. Potter v Potter, M.R. Arnold, Exchange, Southwark st
Tuesday, April 4, 1876.

Birt, Jacob, Southampton st, Fitzroy square, Gent. May 6. Birt v Birt, V.C. Malins. Woodbridge, Cliff rd, in, Fleet st
Briggs, Thomas Sutton, Maida vale, Gent. May 8. Briggs v Goulbourn, V.C. Malins. Boyte, Mecklenburgh square
Bulkeley, Sir Richard Bulkeley Williams, Baron hill, Anglessey, Bart. May 12. Poirre v Bulkeley, V.C. Malins. Olliam, Lincoln's inn fields
Chandler, Stephen, Harleyford rd, Vauxhall, Olman. May 10. Davies v Stokes, V.C. Hall. Kempster, Lower Kennington lane
Cook, John, Branson, Lincoln, Builder. May 6. Cook v Battie, V.C. Hall. Dale, Lincoln
Court, Charles Ambrey, Monmouth, Auctioneer. May 1. Court v Prosser, V.C. Hall. Beddoe, Hereford
Cramp, Robert Strong, Rimgate, Kent, Brewer. May 1. Cramp v Cramp, V.C. Hall. Borman, Ramsgate
Dickinson, Sarah, Birchfield, Stafford. April 25. Mason v Peace, V.C. Malins. Ryland, Lincoln's inn fields
Downs, William, Bourne-mouth, Hants, Gent. May 1. Hopwood v Stevens, M.R. Hopwood at, Sons, Chancery lane
Hannum, Charles, Catherine grove, Greenwich, Kent. May 1. Farr v Hurlstone, V.C. Bacon. Brook, Coleman at
McLean, John Donald, Quiraing, New South Wales, Esq. Sept 29. McLean v Ramsey, V.C. Hall. White and Co, Great Mailborough st
Musgrave, Rev Sir William Augustus, Chinnor, Oxford, Bart. May 1. De Pontieu v Wykeham, M.R. Gordon and Grant, Lincoln's inn fields
Murray, John, Matterdale, Cumberland, Yeoman. April 25. Murray v Milner, V.C. Malins. Shepherd, Appleby
Thomas, David, Ferrytych, Glamorgan, Gent. May 2. Thomas v Jenkins, M.R. Flews, Merthyr Tydfil

Friday, April 7, 1876.

Cole, Richard John, Chiswick, Middlesex, Gent. May 13. Hewer v Lovesey, V.C. Malins. Coldham, New inn, Strand
Jones, David, Bolton, Lancashire, Gent. May 4. Jones v Fisher, V.C. Hall. Boote and Edgar, Manchester
Fox, Hon. Charles Pierrepont, D'Arcy Lane, Oakfield, Penhurst, Kent. May 13. Dawkins v Fox, V.C. Hall. Crowder, Lincoln's inn fields
Gant, Allen, Bolton, York. May 15. Gant v Gant, M.R. Dawson and Groves, Bedford
Heaton, John, Cleckheaton, York, Manufacturing Chemist. May 12. Heaton v Holliday, V.C. Hall. Iveson, Hacknoodwike
Hilton, Rebecca, Langham place, May 1. Marshall v Hilton, V.C. Bacon. Allen, Carlisle at, Soho square
Phillips, Moss, London rd, St John's wood, Esq. May 8. Phillips v Phillips, V.C. Malins. Murray, Backville st, Piccadilly

Creditors under 22 & 23 Viet. cap. 38.

Last Day of Claim.

Friday, March 31, 1876.

Abbott, Emily Eliza, Bath. June 1. Fry and Co, Bristol
Andrew, Christopher, Scarborough, York, Boot Maker. April 29. Richardson, Scarborough
Boyes, John Whatmore, City rd. May 27. Angell and Imbert-Terry, Graham at

Boan, William, Kirby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham, Mineral Viewer. July 1. Smith and Mammatt, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
Borlase, William Grenfell, Ealing, Middlesex, Esq. April 29. Rogers and Chave, Queen Victoria st
Brown, Ann, Southwell, Nottingham. June 24. Sladen and Mackenzie, Delahay st, Westminster
Castwright, Daniel, Naphill, Buckingham, Farmer. May 1. Clarke, High Wycombe
Chapman, John, Wetheringsett, Suffolk, Farmer. May 18. Hayward and Sons, Needham Market
Clements, Jane, Gray's inn rd, Corn Chandler. May 6. Coodo and Co, Bedford row
Cooke, James Lawson, Ogley Hay, Stafford, Surgeon. May 1. Barnes and Russell, Lichfield
Craufurd, Rev Charles Henry, Oldswinford, Worcester. May 31. Bernard and King, Stourbridge
Davies, William, Toronto, Canada, Stockbroker's Clerk. June 24. Gwynne and Stokes, Tenby
Deardon, Henry James, Owerton, York, Common Brewer. May 12. Bramley, Sheffield
Dyson, John, Golcar, Huddersfield, York, Flock Dealer. June 1. Ainley, Huddersfield
Elliott, Edward, Houghton, Sussex, Yeoman. June 1. Edmunds, Worthing
Frith, John, Burregreave, Sheffield, Architect. May 12. Bramley, Sheffield
Gorton, Mary, Instow, Devon. May 9. Toller and Son, Barnstaple
Griffiths, Bridget, Winchester st. May 20. Dolan, Tokenhouse yard
Grinfield, Eliza Maria, Clifton, nr Bristol. May 15. Iliffe and Co, Bedford row
Headland, Frederick William, Margaret st, Cavendish square, Doctor of Medicine. May 12. Walker and Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury Hill, James, Chipping Barnet, Hertford, Gent. May 15. Poole and Hughes, Chancery lane
Humphries, John, Walsall, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. May 1. Glover, Walsall
Hunt, Thomas, Grafton st, Tottenham court rd, Fishmonger. April 29. Goldring, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane
Jones, James, Frant, Sussex, Farmer. May 6. Cripps, Tunbridge Wells
Knyvet, Deborah, Ryde, Isle of Wight. Aug 10. Groatorex, Chancery lane
Littell, Mary Ann Esther, Park House, Dulwich rd. April 30. Oxley, Crosby square
Mogg, John Jenner, Bristol, Esq. July 1. Brittan and Co, Bristol
Mortimore, Richard, Culmington, Devon, Tanner. May 1. Burrow, Culmington
Painter, Elizabeth, Greenfield, Oxford. June 30. Hedges and Co, Wallingford
Price, Frederick, Carshalton, Surrey, Farmer. June 1. Smith, Carshalton
Skinner, Thomas, Stockton, Durham, Esq. May 1. Dodds and Co, Stockton-on-Tees
Stevenson, James, Almeley, Hereford, Yeoman. May 1. Bodenham and Temple, Kingston
Todd, Agnes Martha, Aden grove south, Stoke Newington. April 29. Haves and Co, Russell square
Weale, James, Foling Arundel, Sussex, Gent. May 24. Curtis, Guildford
Willis, Charles, Cardington, Bedford, Farmer. May 1. Lewis and Sons, Wilmington square
Wright, John Robinson, Sumner place, Onslow square, Brompton, Esq. May 31. Davies, Devonshire st, Portland place

Tuesday, April 4, 1876.

Aitken, Hugh, Glasgow, Scotland, Gent. May 31. Wood and Atkinson, Manchester
Aitken, Robert, Manchester, Calico Printer. May 31. Wood and Atkinson, Manchester
Allen, Thomas, Saltby, Leicester, Farmer. May 15. Clarke, Melton Mowbray
Atkinson, William Stephen, Shrewsbury, Salop, Esq. June 30. Croase, Lancaster place, Strand
Barker, John Henry, Bakewell, Derby, Barrister-at-Law. June 8. Walker and Martineau, King's rd, Gray's inn
Barry, Mary, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, nr Manchester. June 30. Whitaker, Lancaster place, Strand
Bode, Mary, Reading, Berks. April 29. Nicholl and Co, Howard st, Strand
Boyd, James, Manchester, Commission Agent. May 31. Wood and Atkinson, Manchester
Bradley, Thomas, Spitalfields, Potato Salesman. June 3. Worthington and Co, Eastcheap
Brown, Lydia, Broughton Sulney, Nottingham. May 31. Watson and Wadsworth, Nottingham
Burham, William Spencer, Aldborough-in-Holderness, York, Brick Maker. May 6. Watson and Son, Hull
Cauciani, Sarah, Commercial rd. May 3. Linde and Co, King's Arms yard, Moorgate st
Clanricarde, Most Hon Harriet Maconchess of, Stratton st. May 1. Capron and Co, Savile place, Conduit st
Colvin, Thomas, Ceylon st, Battersea park rd, Whitesmith. June 30. Smith, Chancery lane
Davis, George, Upper Lawisham rd, New cross, Esq. May 1. Gellatly and Co, Lombard court
Densyer, Mary, Codicote, Hertford. April 29. Knockor, Dover
Dunkerton, Charles, Shepton Mallet, Somerset, Blacksmith. May 13. Zulleid, Glastonbury
Edmunds, John, Southsea, Hants, Bill Broker. May 30. Wade, Olford's inn
Edwards, Henry, Lay End, Worcester, Farmer. May 1. Wraggo and Co, Birmingham
Fisher, Richard, Stow-on-the-Wold, Gloucester, Farmer. April 19. Brookes and Son, Stow-on-the-Wold
Ford, Charles William, Fulham, Dorset, Yeoman. April 13. Fooks, Sherborne
Gage, Col Hon Henry Edward Hall, Whitehall yard, Westminster. May 1. Reoper, Lincoln's inn fields

Gordon, Francis David, Abergeldie, Aberdeenshire, Esq. June 34.
 Biddulph, Chester
 Gresham, John Oughton, Waterloo, nr Liverpool, Gent. May 15.
 Miller and Co, Liverpool
 Houghton, James, Berchomew close, Esq. May 31. Scott, College
 hill, Cannon st
 Houghton, Louisa Ann, Herne hill, Dulwich. May 21. Scott, College
 hill, Cannon st
 Huntaman, Jeronemy, Holly place, Hampstead. May 31. Dod and
 Longstaffe, Berners st
 Hutchins, Edward John, Portland place, Esq. July 1. Bircham and
 Co, Parliament st
 Johnson, Nathaniel, Chesterton, Stafford, Yeoman. May 16. Slaney
 and Son, Newcastle-under-Lyme
 Keddell, William Frederick, Aylesford, Kent, Surgeon. Fryer,
 Gloucester
 Leeming, John, Liverpool, Leather Dealer. May 15. Miller and Co,
 Liverpool
 Newton, John Simpson, Moseley, Worcester, Gent. April 29. Arnold
 and Son, Birmingham
 Nicholas, David, Tallywin, Monmouth, Grocer. May 30. Williams
 and Co, Newport
 Noakes, George, Camden rd, Gent. May 31. Clarke and Co, Gresham
 House, Old Broad st
 Norris, William, Exeter, Auctioneer. May 1. Hirtzel, Exeter
 Olivier, Caroline Mary, Queen's rd, St John's wood. May 1. Collyer-
 Bristol and Co, Bedford row
 O'Ryan, Andrew, Blethingley, Surrey, Esq. June 1. Musgrave, Queen
 Victoria st
 Phipps, Robert, Southwark st, Licensed Victualler. May 22. Layton
 and Co, Budge row, Cannon st
 Reonell, George, Wallington, Surrey, Gent. May 8. Grover and Hum-
 phreys, King's Bench walk, Temple
 Saunders, Susanna, Brighton, Sea-ex. May 31. Dod, Berners st
 Scarle, Edward Samuel, Arthur st, Camberwell, Collector. May 31.
 Dod and Longstaffe, Berners st
 Smith, William, Windsor, Licensed Victualler. May 30. Layton and
 Co, Budge row, Cannon st
 Talbot, Angelina, Bath, Somerset. June 1. Meade and Co, Bristol
 Thornton, Helen Maria, Barnes, Surrey. May 13. Jones and Co,
 Tooley st, Southwark
 Van Siersten, Jacob, Birmingham, Merchant. May 1. Foster, Bir-
 mingham
 Veal, John, St Giles-in-the-Heath, Devon, Farmer. June 24. White,
 and Dingley, Lenneston
 Wallis, Swan, Duxford, Cambridge, Farmer. May 1. Adcock, Cam-
 bridge
 Wilson, Henry, Kingston-upon-Hall, Licensed Victualler. April 10.
 Laverack, Holl
 Winstanton, Maria, Wolvey, Warwick, Farmer. May 16. Woodcock,
 Coventry
 Worsley, William, Kirkham, Lancashire, Innkeeper. May 1. Banks,
 Preston

FRIDAY, April 7, 1876.
 Adcock, William, sen, Laughton, Lincoln, Miller. June 3. Wilkin,
 Lincoln
 Airey, Matthew, Norfolk st, Strand, Esq. May 15. Cookson and Co,
 New square, Lincoln's inn
 Anderson, Charles King, Thatcham, Berks, Esq. July 1. Crowdy and
 Sons, Serjeants' inn, Fleet st
 Bell, William, Southwell, Nottingham, Shopkeeper. May 25. Kirk-
 land, Southwell
 Brocklehurst, George, Macclesfield, Cheshire, Cheesefactor. May 1.
 Killminster and Co, Macclesfield
 Burgess, Joseph, Byles Hall Farm, Stafford, Farmer. May 9. Slaney
 and Son, Newcastle-under-Lyme
 Edwards, Sarah, Newton Abbot, Devon. June 4. Peterick, Exeter
 English, William, Lee, Kent, Esq. May 31. Parker and Clarke,
 St Michael's alley, Cornhill
 Fletcher, Henry, Belisle rd, South Hampstead. May 1. Alfred Du-
 pletier, Cambridge rd, Kilburn
 Harrison, Anne, Chester. May 1. Finchett and Co, Chester
 Hodgson, William Frederic, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey, Brewer
 June 1. Bailly and Co, Berners st
 Hopkinson, Andrew, Glapwell, Derby, Farmer. May 6. Gratton
 Chesterfield
 Hutchins, Edward John, Portland place, Esq. July 1. Bircham and
 Co, Parliament st
 Johnson, Benjamin, New rd, Woolwich rd, Jeweller. May 1. William
 Brain, Powis st, Woolwich
 Jones, John, High Wycombe, Buckingham, Chair Manufacturer. May
 1. Clarke, High Wycombe
 Lonsburgh, Neander, Berlin, Germany. May 31. Davis, Queen's
 Bench walk
 Longden, William, Little Longstone, Derby, Esq. June 7. Taylor,
 Bakewell
 Low, James, Gloucester terrace, Hyde park, Esq. July 1. Duff and
 Co, Nicholas lane
 Martin, Edmund Eastwood, Elm grove, Hammermith, Gent. May 20.
 Nicol and Co, Lime st
 Morris, Albert, Kentworth, Warwick, Commercial Traveller. May 15.
 Van Sandau and Cumming, King st, Chespeide
 Reeve, John, Wimpole st, Esq. Sept 30. Parker and Clarke, St
 Michael's alley, Cornhill
 Ryley, Thomas, Blackburn, Lancashire, Schoolmaster. April 29.
 Ryley and Haslam, Bolton
 Shearman, James, Lingfield, Surrey, Farmer. May 3. Drummond and
 Co, Croydon
 Smith, William, sen, Etherley, Durham, Innkeeper. May. Thorn-
 ton, Bishop Auckland
 Thomas, Rev Charles Lomax, Bowling, Bradford, York. May 27.
 Richardson, Bradford
 Thompson, Robert, Sunderland, Durham, Shipowner. June 11. Snow-
 ball, Sunderland
 Vile, Thomas, Oxford terrace, Paddington, Esq. May 30. Roy and
 Cartwright, Louthbury
 Willeston, John, Holey Cottage, nr Merstham, Surrey, Farmer. May
 8. Hogan and Hughes, Martin's lane, Cannon st

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, April 7, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Newell, Thomas B. Aldersgate st, Accountant. Pet April 6. Pepps.
 April 26 at 12.30

To Surrender in the Country.

Aitkin, Adam, Hexham, Northumberland, Publican. Pet April 4.
 Mortimer, Newcastle, April 24 at 12
 Bickford, Joseph, Birmingham, out of business. Pet March 1. Cole,
 Birmingham, April 25 at 3
 Eady, James, Colchester, Essex, Builder. Pet April 1. Barnes, Col-
 chester, April 22 at 11
 King, William Goddard, Nash, Buckingham, Timber Dealer. Pet
 April 5. Fortescue, Banbury, April 20 at 10.30
 Mann, William, Pinchbeck, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet April 4. Gaches,
 Peterborough, April 22 at 11
 McDowell, Edward, and George Halday, Liverpool, Merchants. Pet
 April 3. Watson, Liverpool, April 20 at 2

TUESDAY, April 11, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Chapman, Charles Pearce Lloyd, Percy st, Bedford square, out of busi-
 ness. Pet April 6. Pepps. April 26 at 2
 Page, John Offord, Dockhead, Butcher. Pet March 11. Hazlitt
 April 26 at 1
 White, Arthur J. C. Inverness terrace, Hyde park. Pet April 7.
 Keene, May 1 at 12
 Wright, William, Great Queen st, Westminster, Contractor. Pet Feb
 14. Brougham. April 25 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Patrick, Joseph, Wellingborough, Northampton, Grocer. Pet April 7.
 Dennis, Northampton, April 27 at 3
 Venn, John James, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. Pet April 7. Wat-
 son, Liverpool, April 24 at 2
 Young, Frederick Thomas, Bedford, Brewer. Pet April 6. Peares,
 Bedford, April 24 at 11.30

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED

FRIDAY, April 7, 1876.

Rawlance, James, Brokenhurst, Hants, Shoe Maker. March 21

TUESDAY, April 11, 1876.

Barnes, Joseph King, Tettenhall, Stafford, Chemistry Master. April 7
 Minoggio, Louis, Charles st, Middlesex Hospital, Goldsmith. April 4

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, April 7, 1876.

Abram, Rivers, Blyford, Suffolk, Farmer. April 18 at 2 at office of
 Moseley, Hall plain, Great Yarmouth
 Adcock, William, Sponlane, Stafford, Greengrocer. April 20 at 11 at
 office of Horner, High st, Brierley hill
 Alexander, Maurice Lewis, Upper terrace, Ilington, Tobaccoist's As-
 sistant. April 18 at 3 at office of Knight, Finabury place north
 Balls, Thomas William, Shefford, Bedford, Manager to a Corollite
 Proprietor. April 21 at 11 at the White Hart Hotel, Shefford.
 Wade, Hitchin
 Bayley, William Charles, Bedford, York, Saddler. April 21 at 11 at
 office of White, Exchange st, Great Driffield
 Bayle, William Isaac Wells, Beresford st, Walworth rd, no occupation.
 April 21 at 3 at 63, Beresford st. Hill, Quinn st, Chestnut
 Bell, John, Manchester, Draper. April 24 at 3 at office of Fox, Prin-
 cess st, Manchester
 Bishop, Edwin, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Greaser. April 15 at 2 at office of
 Alexander Brothers, St Mary st, Cardiff. Evans, Cardiff
 Bland, William, Scarborough, York, Hotel Keeper. April 18 at 11 at
 the Bell Hotel, Bland's cliff, Scarborough. Calvert, Scarborough
 Bradshaw, John, Manchester, Plumber. April 30 at 3 at office of
 Price and Woodcock, St James' square, Manchester
 Brecknell, Job, Torquay, Devon, Watch Maker. April 21 at 3 at office
 of Andrew, Bedford circus. Hooper and Wollen, Torquay
 Briggs, James, Blackburn, Lancashire, Saddler. April 21 at 3 at office
 of Holland, Northgate, Blackburn
 Brockhurst, James, Epsom, Surrey, Upholsterer. April 19 at 2 at
 the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Knight and Ward
 Bruce, Annie Ogilvie, St James' terrace, Regent's park, Authors.
 April 24 at 2 at office of Lee, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st
 Bryan, William, Beibourton, Worcester, Grocer. April 21 at 11 at
 office of Collis, Market st, Stourbridge
 Bullock, Henry, Smithwick, Stafford, Corn Dealer. April 19 at 10.15
 at office of East, Eldon chambers, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Cenk, Edward, Leicester, Fruiterer. April 22 at 3 at office of Wright
 Belvoir st, Leicester
 Capell, Francis, Birmingham, Ironmonger. April 21 at 12 at office of
 Pointon, Temple row west, Birmingham
 Clarke, John, Marsh Baldon, Oxford, Farmer. April 19 at 11 at office
 of Mallam, High st, Oxford
 Cooper, William, Bournemouth, Hants, Hatter. April 19 at 3 at 16,
 Bedford row, Hobern. Aldridge and Sharp
 Curtiss, Caroline, Northrepps, Norfolk, Grocer. April 20 at 1 at office
 of Stanley, Bank pain, Norwich
 Davies, Caleb, Narberth rd, Penbrooke, Coal Agent. April 22 at 3 at
 office of Green and Griffiths, St Mary st, Carmarthen
 Drew, Beriah Harvey, East Grinstead, Sussex, Inspector of Nuisances.
 April 17 at 2 at office of Hams, New Inn, Strid
 Dyer, Daniel Wyatt, South Petherton, Somerset, Grocer. April 20 at
 11 at the George Hotel, Petherton. Paul, Biminstar
 Evans, John, Drybrook, nr Mitcheldean, Gloucester, General Shop-
 keeper. April 19 at 1 at the George Hotel, Ross. Jackson, Stroud
 Fisher, Albert, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire, Clerk. April 20 at 11
 at office of Kerhaw, Town Hall chambers, Ashton-under-Lyne

Freeman, Robert, Pressland terrace, Kensal rd, Harness Maker. April 17 at 3 at offices of Abingdon, Cambridge terrace, Hyde park
 Frisby, John, Warwick, Tobaccoist. April 24 at 12 at offices of Sander-
 son, Church st, Warwick
 Garbutt, Francis, South Eaton, nr Middlesborough, York, Beerhouse
 Keeper. April 17 at 2 at offices of Dobson, Gosford st, Middles-
 borough
 Gardie, William West, Huddersfield, York, Boot Maker. April 18 at 11
 at offices of Bykes, New st, Huddersfield
 Gilbard, Frederick Samson, Horsham, Sussex Tailor. April 24 at 12
 at 148, Cheapside. Bo-beck and Rawlson, Horsham
 Gilkes, Eliab, Moreton Pinkney, Northampton, Innskeeper. April 21 at
 3 at the London and North-Western Hotel, Bismworth
 Gray, Henry, Middlesborough, York, Clerk. April 19 at 10 at offices
 of Gibson and Wilkinson, Athenaeum chambers, Middlesborough
 Dean, Edward, Sunderland, Durham, Yeast Importer. April 19 at 11
 at offices of Graham, John st, Sunderland
 Hale, Joseph, Dewsbury, York, Machiae Maker. April 21 at 3 at offices
 of Scholfield and Son, Wellington rd, Dewsbury
 Handy, James Thomas, Downend, Gloucester, Veterinary Surgeon.
 April 20 at 2 at offices of Pitt, Broad st, Bristol
 Hanson, Alice, York, Milliner. April 19 at 1 at offices of Wilkinson,
 St Helen's square, York
 Harris, Edward Bennett, Shillington, Bedford, Grocer. April 21 at 1
 at offices of Reader, Gray's inn square. Barker, Hichin
 Haskayne, Edward, Liverpool, Pawnbroker. April 20 at 3 at offices of
 Lynch and Teesby, Sweeting st, Liverpool
 Haslewood, Timothy, Oldbury, Worcester, Saddler. April 20 at 11.30
 at offices of Wright, Church st, Oldbury
 Hearn, Walter, Winbolt st, Barnet grove, Hackney rd, Boot Manu-
 facturer. April 20 at 11 at offices of Rogers, Circus place, Finsbury
 circus
 Heuning, William, Birmingham, Baker. April 21 at 11 at offices of
 Barton, Union passage, Birmingham
 Hewett, Thomas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Draper. April 20 at 2 at offices
 of Joels, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Higginson, John, West Bromwich, Stafford, Labourer. April 21 at 11
 at offices of Topham, High st, West Bromwich
 Hilton, Thomas, Dawley, Salop, Diaper. April 21 at 12 at offices of
 Harries, Dawley
 Huchon, Joseph, Tottington Higher end, Lancashire, Cotton Waste
 Dealer. April 20 at 3 at Grant's Arms Hotel, Market place, Ram-
 bottom. Dowling, Bolton
 Holdup, William, Caladonian rd, Islington, Hosier. April 20 at 2 at
 offices of Foreman and Co, Gresham st, Merivins
 Horne, John Thomas, Acoerington, Lancashire, Cabinet Maker. April
 28 at 3 at offices of Hall and Son, Queen st, Accington
 Horsey, James Charles, Lendenhall st, Gum Marchant. April 18 at
 3 at offices of Finch, Bridge chambers, Borough High st, Southwark
 Hughes, Robert, Holyhead, Anglesey, Ironmonger. April 19 at 2 at
 the Ermine Hotel, Flookersbrook, Chester. Barber, Holyhead
 Hughes, William, Wem, 5, lop, Bricklayer. April 21 at 12.30 at offices
 of Bygott, Wem
 Hutchison, Isaac, Maryport, Cumberland, Watch Maker. April 12 at
 3 at offices of Solomon, Ann st, Birmingham, in lieu of the place
 originally named
 Hutchison, Philip, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Wine Merchant. April
 19 at 2 at Labron's Commercial Hotel, Market place, Bishop Auck-
 land. Irvine, Bishop Auckland
 Ingledew, Benjamin, Dealtry, New cross rd, Gent. April 20 at 1 at
 offices of Moss, Gracechurch st
 Ireland, Henry, Rotherhithe st, Licensed Victualler. April 24 at 12 at
 offices of Moss, Gracechurch st
 Jolley, Jacob Ralph, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Fishmonger. April
 13 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Johnson, Jos, Batley Carr, Dewsbury, York, Painter. April 19 at 3 at
 offices of Shaw, Bond st, Dewsbury
 Jones, Rev Thomas Melville, Bryntalder, Glamorgan. April 21 at 11
 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff
 Kesterton, Frederick, Birmingham, Corn Factor. April 17 at 12 at
 offices of Falows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Kingman, Hyman, 10, Wash Material Dealer. April 20 at 3 at
 offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester
 Lear, Joseph, Exeter, Boot Maker. April 20 at 11 at offices of Cam-
 pion, Bedford circus
 Lipton, John Hod-on, Hindley, Lancashire, Slater. April 20 at 2
 at offices of Orton and Bryan, Hindley
 Lutscher, Peter, Aurin friars, Merchant. May 3 at 2 at the Guildhall
 Tavern, Gresham st, Ditton, Ironmonger lane
 Marshall, Jessie Gilchrist, Toomerton, York, Milliner. April 19 at 8
 at offices of Craven, Strand, Toomerton
 Martin, Isaac, Willenhall, Stafford, Edgewood Manufacturer. April 25
 at 11 at offices of Baker, Walsall st, Willenhall
 Martin, James, New cross rd, New cross, Licensed Victualler. April
 22 at 12 at offices of Moss, Gracechurch st
 Miles, James, and Frederick Spenn, Aldersgate st, Jewellers. April
 19 at 3 at offices of Emdin and Robinson, Coleman st, Lunaly and
 Lumley, Old Jewry chambers
 Millward, John, Birmingham, Civil Engineer. April 19 at 3 at offices
 of Wright and Marshall, Townhall chambers, New st, Birmingham
 Morgan, Evan, Llanrwst, Glamorgan, Grocer. April 20 at 1 at offices of
 Alexander Brothers, St Mary st, Cardiff. Thomas
 Page, Henry, Cowper st, City rd, Gloster. April 19 at 4 at offices of
 Knight, Finsbury place North, Finsbury square
 Palmer, James, Scarborough, York, Tailor. April 25 at 3 at offices of
 Williamson, Newborough st, Scarborough
 Parfitt, George, Aberystwyth, Monmouth, Builder. April 21 at 12 at
 offices of Lloyd, Bank chambers, Newport
 Prior, Charles Richard, Liverpool, Tar Merchant. April 19 at 2 at
 offices of Rae and Jenkins, Sweeting st, Liverpool
 Pritchard, William Thorneioe, Blount's Court Farm, Peppard, Oxford,
 Farmer. April 18 at 11.30 at the Great Western Junction Hotel,
 Didcot. Mallam, Oxford
 Quarterman, Edward, Borough High st, Southwark, Woollen Ware-
 houseman. April 19 at 3 at offices of Walker, King's Arms yard,
 M organ st
 Rhodes, Albert, and William Rhodes, Pudsey, York, Engineers. April
 19 at 2 at offices of Routh and Co, Royal Insurance buildings, Park
 row, Leeds. Carr

Rhodes, Edward, Nottin'ham, Traveller. April 19 at 12 at offices of
 Styles, Oak st, Heckmondwike. Acson
 Rhodes, Israel, Batley, York, Butcher. April 25 at 10.30 at offices of
 Wooler, Exchange buildings, Batley
 Roberts, Robert, Haldygarre, Merioneth, Farmer. April 20 at 1 at
 the Royal Ship Hotel, Dolgell. Ellis, Festinog
 Robinson, John, Morley, nr Leeds, Rag Dealer. April 24 at 2 at offices
 of Harle, Bank st, Leeds
 Robinson, John Joseph, Cornhill, Hosier. April 24 at 2 at offices of
 Spyer and Son, Winchester House, Old Broad st
 Robinson, William, Bowscar, Cumberland, Farmer. April 25 at 2 at
 offices of Arlison, St Andrew place, Penrith
 Russell, Omeler, Horwasa, York, Grocer. April 19 at 12 at offices of
 Summers, Manor st, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Scholes, John, Farnworth, Lancashire, Draper. April 24 at 11 at
 offices of Dowling, Wood st, Bolton
 Smith, William Joseph, Dunstable, Bedford, Printer. April 20 at 11 at
 the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Neve, Luton
 Stainton, William, Lymney, Gloucester, Flour Dealer. April 19 at 3 at
 the Queen's Hotel, Bedford. Williams and Co, Newport, Mon
 Stevens, Edward George, Penrance, Cornwall, Confectioner. April 18
 at 11 at offices of Borell, Jan, Quay st, Truro
 Taylor, William Henry, The Shrold, Warwick, out of business. April
 19 at 11.30 at the Golden Lion Hotel, Salford-on-Avon. Warden
 Thomas, David, Llanely, Carmarthen, Cooper. April 18 at 11 at
 offices of Howell, Stepney st, Llanely
 Thomas, Jenkin David Gwiliam, Bidevend, Glamorgan, Agricultural
 Implement Merchant. April 20 at 3 at the Spread Eagle Hotel,
 Gloucester. Stockwood, Jun, Bidevend
 Thompson, Esther, Thoydon rd, Old Ford, out of business. April 18 at 10
 at offices of Long, Lundenow terrace, Grove rd
 Tinsley, William Henry, Kingston-upon-Hull, Professor of Music. April
 15 at 11 at offices of Legge, George st, Sheffield. Egan, Sheffield
 Wilkerson, Edward, Higher Broughton, Lancashire, Coach Builder.
 April 10 at 3 at offices of Riton and Grandy, Cross st, Manchester
 Williams, John, Northampton, Grocer. April 20 at 1 at offices of
 Izard and Betts, Eastcheap. Reed and Lovell, Guildhall chambers
 Williams, William, All Saints rd, Westbourne park, Corn Candler.
 April 20 at 4 at offices of Pain, Marylebone rd
 Wright, Alfred Collins, Ryde, Sussex, Grocer. April 24 at 11 at the
 Bridge House Hotel, London bridge. Langwyn and Son, Hastings
 Wright, James Henry, Kingston-upon-Hull, Journeyman Shipwright.
 April 19 at 3 at offices of Summers, Manor st, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Zwers, Jacob Emil, Park terrace, Old Ford rd, Stick Manufacturer.
 April 20 at 1 at offices of Noon and Clarke, Blomfield st

TUESDAY, April 11, 1876.

Barber, Louis, Peasenhall, Suffolk, Wheelwright. April 25 at 11 at
 offices of Brooks, Church st, Woodbridge
 Barker, John, Ripon, York, Saddler. April 21 at 3 at offices of Bateson,
 Low Harrogate
 Barton, Vincent James, Clement's lane, Commission Agent. April 20
 at 2 at offices of Harper and Co, Road lane
 Blackmore, Christopher, Southmolton, Devon, Shoemaker. May 2 at
 2 at offices of Chanter and Finch, Bridge hall chambers, Barnstable
 Bray, Samuel, and Richard Thompson, Heybrook, nr Tunstall, Stafford,
 Alum Manufacturers. April 20 at 2.30 at the Sneyd Arms Hotel,
 Tunstall. Cotton, Liverpool
 Brearley, Ruben, Southill, Dewsbury, York, Cloth Fuller. April 24 at
 2 at offices of Scholes and Son, Leeds rd, Dewsbury
 Brommel, James, High Wycombe, Boxingham, Tailor. May 4 at 3
 at offices of Reader, Gray's inn square
 Busbridge, Alfred, Salisbury, Wilts, out of occupation. April 24 at 3
 at the Market House, Salisbury. Hodding
 Carrick, Thomas, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Joiner. April 22 at 12 at
 offices of Maw, Jan, High Bondgate, Bishop Auckland
 Cayford Samuel, Cambridge rd, Edgeware rd, Canon Smith. April 19
 at 4 at offices of Yorks, Marylebone
 Chester, Cornelius, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. April 21 at 12
 at offices of Walker, Market square, Northampton
 Clark, Henry, Exeter, Fancy Draper. April 25 at 12 at offices of Lad-
 bury and Co, Chesham, Bucks
 Clarke, John, Eramont, Cheshire, out of business. April 28 at 11 at
 offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool
 Clark-on, Thomas, Ilkley, York, Coal Merchant. April 24 at 3 at offices
 of Margerson and Hutton, Market st, Bradford
 Cliff, Richard, Birmingham, Box Maker. April 20 at 11 at offices of
 James, Temple st, Birmingham
 Cook, George, and Thomas Mills, Blyth, Northumberland, Joiners.
 April 21 at 3 at offices of Nicholson, Bridge st, Morpeth
 Cunliff, James, South Shields, Durham, General Dealer. April 24 at
 12 at offices of Blair, King st, South Shields
 Culler, George, Birmingham, Hook and Eye Manufacturer. April 21
 at 3 at offices of Brown, Waterloo st, Birmingham
 Damsell, Henry William, Liverpool, Coal Merchants. April 24 at 3 at
 offices of Parkinson, Commerce court, Lord st, Liverpool
 Davis, David, Trawate, Monmouth, Smith. April 26 at 2 at the
 Griffin Hotel, Brynmawr. Davies
 Daw, George Henry, Threanodde st, Gun Maker. April 24 at 1 at the
 Cannon street Hotel. Blake and Snow, College hill
 Dedman, James, Durham rd, Seven Sisters' rd, Cow Keeper. April
 20 at 2 at offices of Griffiths, Queen Victoria st. Lane, Foultry
 Dentley, John, Preston, Lancashire, General Broker. April 25 at 3 at
 offices of Ambler, Cannon st, Preston
 Dyer, Samuel, Euston rd, House Builder. April 27 at 11 at offices of
 Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Fenton
 Edwards, James, Middlesborough, Grocer. April 22 at 10 at offices of
 Hope, Bridge st west, Middlesborough
 Ewins, James, and Ernest James Ewins, Newport, Monmouth, Wine
 Merchants. April 24 at 1 at offices of Tribe and Co, High st, New-
 port. Pain and Son, Newport
 Farrow, Alfred, and John William Blithough, Bradford, York, Brush
 Manufacturers. April 24 at 11 at offices of Lees and Co, New In-
 gate, Bradford
 Fellows, John, Wednesbury, Stafford, Scrap Iron Dealer. April 25 at
 2.30 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wednesbury
 Fletcher, George, Jun, and James Fletcher, Woolwich, Kent, Millers.
 May 2 at 2 at offices of Cape and Harris, Old Jewry. Poole, Bar-
 tholomew close

Gibbs, James, Market Harborough, Leicester, Grocer. April 21 at 3 at offices of Owsen, Friar lane, Leicester
 Gibson, David, Wolstanton, Stafford, Fishmonger. April 24 at 11 at the Railway Hotel, Congleton. Stevenson, Hanley
 Gilbert, Thomas, Chesapeake, Pillow Lace Manufacturer. April 26 at 11 at offices of Ladbury and Co, Chesapeake. Carter, Austin friars
 Gillman, Charles Brown, Deal, Kent, Pilot. April 27 at 10 at 98, Middle street, Deal. Brew
 Grist, John, Chichester, Sussex, Innkeeper. April 27 at 3 at the Eagle Hotel, West st, Chichester. Holtham, Brighton
 Hall, James Warren, Blackfriars rd, Coal Merchant. April 21 at 12 at offices of Hewlett, Essex st, Strand
 Hall, William Charles, Upper Thames st, Provision Dealer. April 24 at 3 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Reynolds, Furnival's inn
 Harding, Robert, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Commission Agent. April 21 at 11 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Hardy, Frederick Charles, Sibbs Heddingham, Essex, Miller. April 24 at 11 at the Horn Hotel, Braintree. Cannington, Braintree
 Haswell, Thomas Partis, Seaham Harbour, Durham, out of business. April 21 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland
 Harward, Mary Jane, Minehead, Somerset, Innkeeper. April 20 at 12 at offices of Milne and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol
 Henderson, Catherine, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Innkeeper. April 25 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Forster, Grainger st west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Herbert, George, Eltham, Kent, Carrier. April 25 at 11 at 145, Chesapeake. Robinson, Christchurch passage, Newgate st
 Holt, William Henry, Bath, Professor of Music. April 24 at 12 at offices of Wilton, Westgate buildings, Bath
 Hibbert, William, Preston, Lancashire, Hatter. April 27 at 11 at offices of Thompson, Chapel st, Preston
 Holysfield, Thomas, Ascot, Oxford, Farmer. April 29 at 2 at 26, Pembroke st, Oxford. Cooper, Chancery lane
 Des, Edward, Pilsnol st, East India rd, Builder. April 26 at 1 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st. Young, Serjeants' inn, Fleet st
 Jennings, Sydney Charles, Reading, Bucks, Grocer. April 25 at 3 at 50, London st, Reading. Beale and Martin
 Jones, Edward Joseph, Turk's Head court, Golden lane, Packing Case Maker. April 18 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane
 Kirkpatrick, Henry, Distinguon, Cumberland, Tailor. April 25 at 3 at offices of McKelvie, Sandhills lane, Whitehaven
 Knight, Thomas, Cinderford, Gloucester, Grocer. April 22 at 12.30 at the Beeth Hall Hotel, Westgate st, Gloucester. Jackson, Stroud
 Knowles, James, Shipley, nr Bradford, York, Draper. April 20 at 11 at offices of Lees and Co, New Ilogate, Bradford
 Le macle, Richard, Leicester. April 21 at 10.15 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Landow, Martha, Bath, Somerset, Lodging House Keeper. April 19 at 11 at offices of Simmons and Clark, Mansers st, Bath
 Layne, Solomon, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Outfitter. April 25 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, St Mary st, Cardiff. Spencer, Cardiff
 Lickies, George, Skirraugh-in-Holderess, York, Blacksmith. April 22 at 11 at offices of Watson and Son, Parliament st, Hull
 Loftus, John, Cleveland st, Mile End, Tailor. April 26 at 12 at offices of Vann, Worship st, Finsbury
 Mendes, Mirza Diljan Ali, Walbrook st, Hoxton, Cerman. April 29 at 10 at offices of Howard, Southampton buildings, Holborn
 Marsh, John James, Preston, Lancashire, Army Penitencer. April 24 at 3 at offices of Forster, Cannon st, Preston
 Martin, George Smalley, Sea-borough, York, Stationer. April 25 at 3 at offices of Williamson, Newbrough st, Scarborough
 McCarthy, Thomas Irvin, Withington, nr Manchester, Agent. April 26 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester
 McEwen, James, Manchester, Fent Dealer. April 24 at 3 at offices of Payne and Galloway, Brazennose st, Manchester
 Michael, James, Handsworth, Stafford, Jewellery Factor. April 21 at 11 at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson place, Birmingham. Davies, Birmingham
 Middleton, Francis George, and Samuel William Marriott, Great Tower st, Colonial Brokers. April 21 at 2 at offices of Howell, Queen Victoria st
 Miles, Thomas Reuben, Piccadilly walk, Notion, Boot Maker. May 4 at 11 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Fenton
 Morrill, Thomas, York, Grocer. April 24 at 3 at offices of Crumlie, Stonegate, York
 Morris, John, Jerrow, Durham, Spirit Merchant. April 21 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Forster, Grainger st west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Nash, George, Guildford rd, Greenwich, Clothier. April 25 at 2 offices of Pook and Son, Tudor House, Greenwich
 Newsham, Thomas, Settle, York, Shoe Maker. April 25 at 3 at offices of Robinson and Robinson, Settle
 Norris, William, Newbury, Berks, Carpenter. April 21 at 11 at the White Hart Hotel, Newbury. Lucas, Newbury
 Norton, Henry, and Alfred Norton, Manchester, Steel Manufacturers. April 21 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester
 Patton, John, York buildings, Adelphi, out of business. April 19 at 3 at Masons' Hall Tavern, Basinghall st. Crammond, Carter lane, Doctors' commons
 Petherick, Ezekiel James, Camborne, Cornwall, Ironmonger. April 25 at the Grand Hotel, Broad st, Bristol, in lieu of the place originally named
 Phillips, Evan, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. April 21 at 12 at offices of Rosser, Canon st, Aberdare
 Pollard, John, Dalton, Huddersfield, York, Waste Dealer. April 24 at 2.30 at offices of Sykes and Son, Lord st, Huddersfield
 Price, Robert, Penzance, Glamorgan, Grocer. April 15 at 39, Broad st, Bristol, in lieu of the place originally named
 Probert, John Jones, Ton, Glamorgan, Grocer. April 25 at 12 at the Cardiff Arms Hotel, Cardiff. Thomas
 Raynor, Louis, Grove st, South Hackney, Boot Manufacturer. May 4 at 3 at Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Chaik, Moorgate st
 Redfern, James, Bath, Somerset, Grocer. April 24 at 11 at offices of Dyer, Queen's square, Bath
 Rees, William, Gipsy rd, Lower Norwood, Baker. April 26 at 3 at offices of Young and Thompson, St James st, Bedford row

Ride, Jacob, Birmingham, Beer Retailer. April 22 at 11 at offices of Parry, Benett's Hall, Birmingham
 Richardson, Charles Frederick, and Frederick Platts, Leeds, Cordial Manufacturers. April 22 at 11 at offices of Harwick, Infirmary at, Leeds
 Santon, Samuel Hobson, South Wingate, Durham, Ale Merchant. April 26 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Search, George, Jun, Hinderwell, York, Tailor. April 21 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Sedgwick, William, East Sutton, Kent, Farmer. April 27 at 3 at offices of Norton and Son, Earl st, Maidstone
 Self, Thomas William, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Gasfitter. April 29 at 3 at offices of Oaks, Bank plain, Norwich
 Shepherd, Joseph Owen, West Hartlepool, Durham, Music Teacher. April 26 at 3 at offices of Todd, Surtees st, West Hartlepool
 Sherratt, Henry, Silverdale, Stafford, Coldier. April 20 at 11 at the Castle Hotel, Newcastle-under-Lyme. Tennant, Hanley
 Simmons, Charles, Kingston-upon-Hull, Grocer. April 21 at 12 at offices of Stead and Sibree, Bishop lane, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Smith, John, Manchester, Provision Dealer. April 28 at 11 at offices of Whist, King st, Manchester
 Smith, John, Westmorland rd, Walsworth, General Dealer. May 1 at 3 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st, Waring, Borough High st, Southwark
 Sparrow, George Young, Old Kent rd, Tailor. April 19 at 3 at offices of Bilton, Vassall rd, Camberwell
 Stephens, Matthew, Liverpool, Wine Retailer. May 5 at 3 at offices of Vine, Dale st, Liverpool. Blackharat, Liverpool
 Tesle, John, Boston Spa, York, Joiner. April 25 at 3 at offices of Hayes and Co, Britannia buildings, Oxford place, Leeds. Rhodes, South Milford
 Thatcher, William, Abingdon, Berks, Builder. April 29 at 3 at 25, Pembroke st, Oxford. Cooper, Chancery lane
 Thornton, Richard, and George Thompson, Leeds, Cavers. April 21 at 3 at offices of Lodge, Park row, Leeds
 Thomas, Rees, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Woollen Manufacturer. April 25 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff
 Tooth, Alexander, and Oliver Baker, Sheffield, Coal Merchants. April 24 at 12 at offices of Iboutson, Change alley, Sheffield
 Turnbull, Mary Isabella, Sunderland, Durham, Hostler. May 1 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland
 Tyrer, Thomas Savage, Jun, Liverpool, Traveller. April 25 at 12 at offices of Carruana, Clayton square, Liverpool
 Vane, Thomas James, Southampton, Watch Maker. April 24 at 12 at offices of Coxwell and Co, Gloucester square, Southampton
 Walker, Thomas, Hanley, Stafford, Grocer. April 20 at 2 at offices of Tennant, Chesapeake, Hanley
 Watkins, George, Mauley terrace, Kennington park rd, Agent. April 22 at 12 at offices of Day, Bloomsbury square, Finsbury, Brixton lane
 Whatham, William, and Henry Edward Benson, Liverpool, Spices Merchants. April 27 at 2 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Beltinger, Liverpool
 Whitehead, Matthew, Shipley, York, Plasterer. April 24 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrrell st, Bradford
 Wilde, George, Leeds, Coal Dealer. April 22 at 11 at offices of Feras, Bank st, Leeds
 Wilks, James Ashenden, Moat place, Stockwell green, Builder. April 21 at 3 at offices of Chipperfield, Trinity st, Southwark
 Willey, Johnson, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Provision Dealer. April 21 at 3 at offices of Garbutt and Fawcett, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Wilson, John Pearce, Oris rd, Berks, Chemist. April 25 at 1 at offices of Young and Sons, Mask lane
 Wilson, Thomas, and William Wilson, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Butchers. April 24 at 2.30 at offices of Paiton, Irish st, Whitehaven
 Winkley, John, Jan, Wiesbeck, Cambridge, Outfitter. April 24 at 3 at the Angel Hotel, Peterborough. Ollard and Co, Wiesbeck
 Wood, Wilnot, Hanley, Stafford, Commission Agent. April 19 at 11 at offices of Stevenson, Chesapeake, Hanley
 Wyld, James John, Manchester, Warehouseman. April 25 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester
 Young, William, Liverpool rd, Islington, Grocer. April 27 at 3 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane. Sturt, Ironmonger lane

EDE AND SON.

ROBE MAKERS.



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,
 To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench
 Corporation of London, &c.
SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.
 BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.
 CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS &c
 ESTABLISHED 1834.
 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
 PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
 ETC.
 CHANCERY-BUILDINGS, 23, CHANCERY-LANE,
 LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Judicature Affidavits
 Appeals
 Parliamentary Minutes
 Books
 Pamphlets
 Reports
 Rules

Catalogues
 Prospectuses
 Magazines
 Newspapers
 Circulars
 Posters
 Handbills, &c., &c